

4183.66-61

A
VINDICATION

Of some Points of *Doctrine*,

Apprehended by many to be included in that
sound Speech which cannot be condemned.

Being an *ANSWER*

To the *Remarks*

O F

The Rev. Messieurs WIGGLESWORTH
and CHIPMAN.

In an ADDRESS to those Gentlemen.

By WILLIAM BALCH, A. M. *

Pastor of the second Church in Bradford.

Tim. vi. 3, 4. *If any Man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome Words, even the Words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the Doctrine which is according to Godliness; he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about Questions and Strifes of Words.*

That a Man is *not* justified by Faith only, saith, not the fallible St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, Theodoret, or Bernard, but the inspired Apostle St. JAMES, Chap. II. 24.

Unus apex Verbi ratione valentior, omni

Milleq; Decretis, Conciliisq; prior.

BOSTON, Printed by ROGERS and FOWLE for J. EDWARDS
in Cornhill. 1746.

OLD CATHOLIC

Of some kind of Delineation

• A suggested by many to be included in that

Revised 10/1/88

TO THE HONORABLE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY
WASHINGTON, D. C.



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

BY WILLIAM BARON MALLORY

Printed at the Government Press, Calcutta.

It is worth recording nothing, but being able to do so.

[illegible]

James O. Smith, Jr., Secretary

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



An ADDRESS

To the Reverend Messieurs *Wigglesworth*,
and *Chipman*, on their *Remarks*.

Reverend Gentlemen,

AT the Time your *Remarks* came out, I had much upon my Hands. A singular Sort of *Council* was hovering about us; having adjourned from *June 17.* to *July 15.* in Expectation, we suppose, of your *Assistance*: Which having obtained by the publishing of your Book, they soon waded through the Difficulties that before laid in their Way, thinking, no Doubt, they had now sufficient Proof.

There was also a *brief Narrative* subscribed by a Number of our aggriev'd Brethren, which, making its public Appearance about the same Time, for a while engag'd our Attention. But being at Length rid of those Evils, I now apply my self to *your Piece*; and would, with all the Calmness and Patience I am Master of, take Notice of the several Things you have advanced against me; *rectifying* your Mistakes, and *vindicating* my Doctrine, by such Light from *Reason* and *Scripture*, as I shall be able to produce.

I can't help letting you know, in the *first Place*, that I don't take well the Formality of your Address to the *Ministers and Churches in the Land*, and the Manner in which you choose to express your selves as being *offended* with these and those Things. It looks as if you had a Mind the Controversy should be decided by the Ministers and Churches taking me in Hand. Whereas, I think there is Nothing in the Sermon, or in the other Points you remark upon, but what may be left to the Decision of *Reason* and *Argument*, and the Evidence of *Scripture*, so far as that will go, without calling in the Aid of *ecclesiastical Authority*. For I apprehend, that
the

the *Difference* in Point of *real Sentiment*, AS TO THE WAY TO GOD'S FAVOUR AND ETERNAL LIFE, is not, and cannot be very great between us ; how differently soever we may chuse to exprefs our selves upon several Occasions.

And I particularly take it ill, that you should suffer your *Fears* and *Jealousies* so continually to outrun any Evidence you are able to give of my *Unsoundness*. Indeed, *Gentlemen*, it would have look'd better, and would have been acting a kinder and more friendly Part to me and others, if you had answered my *Arguments*, and removed my *Objections* here and there, instead of saying that these and those Things " are " not agreeable to the *Divinity* of the *reformed Churches* in " their *purest State*." When the purest State of the reformed Churches was with Respect to Doctrine, I cannot tell, but am very sure, it is unreasonable to suppose it was just upon their emerging out of the Darknes of *Popery* in *Luther's Time*, or in the Time of his immediate Successors. Doctrines do not use to be best understood the first Moment Men apply their Minds to the understanding of them. Nor was Learning at that Day in so flourishing a State (or indeed true Christian Piety) that it should give to any such an Apprehension. If I have any Knowledge in *History* at all (and I pretend to no great) even the Churches of the *Reformation* were full of Darknes, Confusion, and Bloodshed, for a long Time after the Dawn of that happy Day : And as the rising Sun, which shines more and more to mid-day Light, so have the Errors of *Popery* and the Darknes of Superstition and Bigotry, been gradually dispel'd : So that if you had spared the Reflections which you sometimes bestow upon my supposed verging towards the Doctrines of the *Romish Church*, your Performance had not been less perfect. But however, not to insist upon this.

As you acknowledge the *Scripture* an infallible Touchstone of Truth, to this I shall constantly make my Appeal. If any Notions of mine will not stand by this *Test*, I desire to let them fall. If on the contrary, I can vindicate my self by the *Law* and by the *Testimony*, I think I may do it without regard to any *human Forms* whatever. For if God has made a *Revelation* of his Mind and Will, we are not at Liberty to think as we please : We are accountable to him for our Sentiments and religious Perswasions : Nor shall be able to justify our selves by pleading, that we followed these or those whom we took to be eminent Persons. We may call no Man
Master

Master or Father upon the Earth, nor be Followers of any Man, or of any Body of Men, further than they have followed Christ, the only authentic Revealer of his Father's Counsels, and the Author and Finisher of our Faith.

If my Doctrine and Principles are agreeable to Scripture, it is as far as I need be concern'd. If in Consequence of this, they should happen to be inconsistent with the *Divinity* of the reformed Churches, it is that *Divinity*, and not my Doctrine, which ought to be deemed *unsound*.

I say not this, however, from any Diffidence of the Agreeableness of my Principles to the Principles of the Reformation, allowing for the different Use of Terms, and the more clear and consistent Way of conceiving and treating of Things, since those *Forms* (in which you may imagine their Principles are best exprest) were compos'd : But only to shew that the Argument is of no Importance.

One infallible Touchstone of Truth is sufficient, and is all that can be admitted. I therefore look upon it to be a very faulty Thing in you, *Gentlemen*, that you take in the *Divinity* of the reformed Churches (though in their purest State) into a Sort of Competitorship with the *Bible* ; and that it is no other than a departing from the best and most fundamental Principle of *that Reformation*, which you would appear to do Honour to.

Indeed the Judgment and Works of learned Men may be of Use to us, in assisting us to discover and find out the true Sense of Scripture. In which Respect I think we cannot be too thankful for the great Advantages and Helps which we of the *present Age* enjoy, above what they enjoyed who lived a *Century* or two ago. But after all, we should endeavour to see with our own Eyes, and to understand with our own Understandings : And the *sacred Scriptures alone* should be the Measure and Standard of our Belief, and of our Doctrine : And where these cease to be our Guide in any Matter of Doctrine or religious Controversy, there I should think the *Religion* of that Controversy might be supposed to end.

But to pass from this.

The *first* Thing you complain of in the *Sermon* you have taken in Hand, is the Design of it. " The evident Design (you say) of the *Sermon* (in your Apprehension) is to attribute to Works or Christian Obedience such a Part in Man's Justification as is contrary to Scripture." --- A very heavy

heavy Charge ! But I think, *Gentlemen*, you allow in Pag. 17, that the *profess'd Aim* of the Sermon is more modest, viz. "To reconcile the two Apostles respecting Faith and Works." If you mean here, that, different from the *profess'd Aim* of the Sermon, my real Intention was to attribute to Works or Christian Obedience such a Part in Man's Justification as is *contrary to Scripture*, you do me great Wrong. Whether I do attribute to Works or Christian Obedience such a Part in Justification as is contrary to Scripture, may perhaps be seen in the Sequel : But that I had any such Intention, *could any Body suspect it*, I would utterly deny.

My Intention was, to do Honour to the sacred Scriptures ; not to contradict them in any Thing ; but to shew, they do not contradict themselves. I aim'd at reconciling the two Apostles in such a Manner as should be consistent with the Honour of both those *Texts*, with which I introduced my Discourse. How far I succeeded in it, I must leave to others to judge. But the Interpretation that was often given of the Apostle *Paul* in one of those *Texts*, appeared to me subversive of any Interpretation of the Apostle *James* in the other, consistent with Truth and good Sense : And this had proceeded so far, that the very *Language* of St. *James* was become *strange* ; and when followed by any, though the *Language of Inspiration*, was yet not seldom cried out upon as *unsound*. This moved me to undertake that Discourse ; to see if the Apostles could not be reconciled in a *Way* that should preserve the Honour of *both* those inspired Writers, and render the *Language* of St. *James* as useful and edifying as that of St. *Paul* : Which, if it was thought he treated upon a Subject *different from that of all the rest of the Bible*,† it could not be supposed to be.

Thus

† The great Subject and Business of the holy Scriptures, it seems to me, is to point out to Men the Way to Acceptance and Favour with God, and in Consequence of that, to Glory and Happiness in the World to come. Thus in the Beginning of the Bible, Gen. 4. 7. *If thou dost well, shalt thou not be accepted ?* And thus in the latter End, Rev. 22. 14. *Blessed are they that do his Commandments, that they may have Right to the Tree of Life, &c.* Now, if it was thought, the Apostle *James*, diverse from all the rest of the inspired Writers, was treating only of the Way to Credit and Fame ; or at most, of the Way to this with the Ease and Quiet of our own Minds ; I apprehended it would be a great Disadvantage to his Book ; and indeed that it was a greater Dishonour to the holy Scriptures in general, to have this supposed of any Book in the

Thus of the *Design* of my Sermon, which you so severely reflect upon ; and of the *Motive* I had at first to compose and preach it ; and afterwards consent to its Publication.

I was going to say, in the *next* Place, that you do me the Justice to own, that I don't place Works in the Room of Christ's Merits : But the Manner of your expressing this is so faulty, that I must needs say, you do me no Justice in it. Your Words are, P. 6. " Nor do we *accuse* Mr. Balch as *directly* and *explicitly* placing the Works of the Law, in the Room of Christ's Merits, respecting Man's Justification, several Passages in his Sermon carrying a *Face* to the contrary."

And do you indeed, *Gentlemen* think, that you do me a Favour in *not accusing* me of this ? Had I left any Room for it ?---I had directly and explicitly warn'd People against placing their own Duties and good Works in the Room of Christ's Merits, in a Sermon that came out at the same Time with this you remark upon : And in this very Sermon had said, " Inasmuch as we are Sinners, have come short of the Glory of God, and in many Things offended him ; we are therefore forever to admire and adore the infinite Mercy of the divine Being in providing a Saviour for us : and are to hope for the Pardon of our Sins and for eternal Life, as *free Gifts*, Gifts of the freest and richest Grace through Jesus Christ." Pag. 20.

Again, Pag. 30, and 31. ' Let us not deceive our selves as though we were capable of meriting by them, (i. e. by our good Works) as though we could bring the infinite God into our Debt by any Thing we can do. Leave this for foolish *Papists* to imagine.--- As for us, we are divinely taught, when we have done all those Things which are com-

the Bible, than it would be if that Book was wholly excluded out of the sacred Canon. Yet I had met with such an Interpretation of this Apostle among our selves, (*viz.* such as I could not but think, had a Tendency to lead People to this unworthy, unsuitable Opinion of the Subject he was upon, even in the most solemn Part of his Epistle :) And could conceive of no other Reason for it, than only that weak and contracted Minds were offended at the two principal *Phrases* he uses, being in direct Opposition to their beloved Way of speaking ; when otherwise, setting aside the meer Terror of Sounds, he appears to lay no other Stress upon a renewed and sanctified Temper of Mind, and a holy and religious Course of Life, than the rest of the holy Scriptures every where do.

manded

manded us, to say, we have done but our Duty and are *unprofitable Servants*.---

Let us for ever acknowledge and adore the free Grace of God and the precious Merits of Christ in all the Blessings we enjoy.---- And in the several Passages which you have cited, I had carefully observed the same Manner of speaking, still expressing my self so, as in the clearest Manner to intimate, That all our Hopes are ultimately thro' Christ, ' thro' the Mercy of God and the Merits of Christ Jesus." Why then, *Gentlemen*, do you express your selves thus, " Nor do we accuse Mr. *Balch* as directly and explicitly placing, " &c ?" Was it well in you to express your selves in this Matter, so as to leave upon the Minds of your Readers a Jealousy that though indeed my Sermon in diverse Places carries a Face to the contrary, yet *indirectly, implicitly, and under Covert*, I do place good Works in the Room of Christ's Merits ? I abhor the Tho't, as much as you can possibly do.

Nor should you have said, " Works of the Law." You know I place *these* no where in *Christianity*. And for the *Works of the Gospel*, Christian Obedience, and even Faith its self, I place not these in the Room of Christ's Merits ; but constantly warn People against it : And hope you do the same. Why then do you chuse the Phrase, *Works of the Law* ? Do you include in Works of the Law, Obedience to the Gospel ; and in particular, Obedience to that great Command of God, *that we should believe on the Name of his Son Jesus Christ*, 1 Joh. 3. 23 ? If you do not ; you know, your Concession is far short of the Truth. It is not so far, as I go ; nor so far as, I hope, you go. But alas, how will Fondness for a particular Phrase sometimes mislead Men !

After this, which had it been properly expressed, would have been worth carrying in Mind to the End of the Controversy ; and after a little Boggle whether I " join *Works* " with Faith or set *them alone* as the Condition of our receiving Justification by Christ's Merits ;" for which there was not the least Reason ; since whenever I use the Words *Faith* and *Works* together, I never mean the same Thing by both, but would intimate, that *Assent* to the great and fundamental Truths of the Gospel is necessary, as well as that, in other Respects, we should be good Men : And it is *your* justifying Faith which is a Work even by your own Concession ; tho' it does not *as a Work* justify. I say after this, you state the Matter of Offence (as you call it) thus, " my joining Works " with

“ with Faith as the Method or Condition of our receiving
 “ and becoming entitled to Christ’s justifying Merits.” i. e.
 I suppose you mean, as the Condition of our being accepted
 of God through Christ into a State of Grace and Favour, and
 entitled by the Promises of the Gospel to all the Benefits of
 Redemption by Christ Jesus, to Pardon of Sins and eternal
 Life. And what if you should mean the same Thing by *Faith*
 in this Case, that I do by *Faith and Works* ; where will the
 great Difference be between us then ? That you do, I shall
 not venture to determine ; (though I would charitably hope
 so much) but only declare, that by Faith and Works when
 thus joined together I mean no more than *Assent* to the great
 and fundamental Truths of Christianity, with correspondent
 Acts of the Will in *consenting* to be govern’d and dispos’d of
 accordingly ; particularly to be governed by Christ’s Laws
 and Precepts, as well as to be saved through his Blood and
 Righteousness.

I had said in Pag. 12. of my Sermon, ‘ The proper and
 ‘ natural Effects of a divine Faith, or those Virtues and Gra-
 ‘ ces of a Christian Temper and heavenly Life, which are
 ‘ the genuine Consequences of a firm Belief of the Gospel ;
 ‘ though we are not justified by them *meritoriously* as though
 ‘ they were the Matter, Ground, or procuring Cause of a
 ‘ Sinner’s Acceptance with God ; yet are they, together with
 ‘ *Faith*, the Condition of the Gospel-Covenant, or what God
 ‘ requires on our Part in Order to our inheriting that eternal
 ‘ Life which Jesus Christ hath purchased.”

And a little after, in the same Page, ‘ That Christ by his
 ‘ Gospel and Grace first brings Men through Faith and Re-
 ‘ pentance to true Goodness, to a sincere though imperfect
 ‘ Conformity to the divine Image and Will ; and then has
 ‘ obtained the Acceptance of God and eternal Life for them.
 Again, Pag. 19. ‘ That what those Ministers who in these
 ‘ Times are stigmatiz’d for *legal Preachers*, contend for, is,
 ‘ that Men should be Christians in Heart as well as Head, in
 ‘ Practice as well as Profession, in Reality as well as Name ;
 ‘ must be sober, just, temperate, meek, merciful, heavenly-
 ‘ minded, devoted to the Will of God, &c. not as the Way
 ‘ to *merit* Heaven, but only as the Way to come to the En-
 ‘ joyment of the Possession purchased for them by the Lord
 ‘ Jesus Christ ; into which *Nothing that defileth, or worketh*
 ‘ *Abomination, or maketh a Lie, can, in the Nature of Things,*
 ‘ enter, and be happy.”

What have you against these Passages ? Are they of too *legal* a Strain ? Will no other *Sound* please you but that of *Faith* ?---The Death and Sufferings of Christ or his Obedience and Righteousness, are acknowledged explicitly *even* in the midst of all this, as the sole, meritorious, procuring Cause of the returning Favour of God to a lost and perishing World. But only, Repentance and new Obedience, Holiness, Piety, Charity, Justice and Temperance, &c. are pleaded for as necessary on our Part, in order to our being in the Way to Happiness ; as well as Faith. Is this speaking out too *plainly* ; when it wou'd be better to include *all* in the single Term of *Faith* ? Do I thus leave no Room for Sinners to deceive themselves, as if *meer naked Assent to revealed Truths*, will do : Or that attaching themselves to a *Party*, and professing to believe what they in no wise understand, nor are a Bit the better Men for, will answer in the Room of all Christian Virtues ? Are all those other Words but Faith, *unsanctified*, and no where to be met with in the *Bible* ? Or, is there no Stress any where laid upon them, as expressing Things necessary on our Part in order to our being in the Way to Happiness ?

Let me ask you soberly ; has Jesus Christ purchased eternal Life for any but those who are prevailed with, by his Gospel *accompanied with the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven*, to have their *Fruit unto Holiness* ? Does he make Intercession with God to take wicked Men, *continuing such*, into his Favour ? Can any be acceptable to God without some Imitation, or Resemblance of him in his moral Perfections and Excellencies ?

Yet after citing these Passages from my Sermon, and a few others exactly of the same Tenor, you proceed in a very grave and solemn Manner, to ask the Question, " And now is this " the scriptural Doctrine of Justification ? Is this Account " of it agreeable to the Principles of the reformed Churches ? "

The *latter* Question I shall leave to be decided by the *former*. But as to the *former*, would say, if you mean, is this all that the Scripture teaches, is this the whole Scripture-Account of the Way and Method of God's justifying a Sinner ; or of his bringing the sinful and perishing Children of Men to eternal Happiness through Christ : I say, if this is the Meaning of your Question ; I freely answer, *no* ; it is not. And if you had cited my whole Sermon, I should have said the same. For it was not my Design or Intention in that short Discourse to grasp the whole Scripture-Doctrine of the Way
and

and Means to Happiness ; but only to reconcile the Apostles *Paul* and *James* with Respect to their different Usage of the Terms *Faith* and *Works*.

I knew, and had often preach'd, *That we are justified freely by the Grace of God through the Redemption that there is in Jesus Christ*. This I supposed my Hearers (or Readers) might already be instructed in ; that they would carry it in their Minds ; and that what they would *then* expect from me, (agreeable to the Passages of Scripture first read) was, that I should consider the Part assign'd to Faith and Works in the same great Affair : And in particular, if *that was the Truth*, that I should shew how *these* both intend the same Thing, each including the other.

If therefore your Question is, (not, is this the whole Scripture-Doctrine ? But) are these Passages cited and the rest of the Sermon which is generally of the same Strain ; are these agreeable to Truth, and do they properly express the Part assign'd to Faith and Works in the Scripture-Account of the Way to Happiness ? I say, if this is your Question ; I then answer in the *Affirmative* : And am ready to maintain, not only the Truth of these Passages, but their Agreeableness to the whole Current of Scripture. I freely give my Opinion, That the inspired Writers universally agree, and that it is the whole Tendency and Scope of their Doctrine every where to assure us, (and in the most perfect Conformity too with the best Reason of Mankind,) that *well-doing* is as necessary as *right believing*, in Order to Acceptance and Favour with God through Christ.

It is possible that you, *Gentlemen*, may be of a different Mind from me in this Matter. By your citing these Passages it should seem, that you did not think with me in them : Tho' I confess, I cannot conceive, *how it should be*.---- But be your Opinion as it will, I shall now proceed in the Defence and Vindication of my own. And I argue after this Manner ; if *St. James's* Justification is the same with that of the Apostle *Paul*, viz, That great and important Justification which includes in it Remission of Sins and the divine Acceptance, and which puts a Man in the Way to eternal Life ; then it clearly follows, *not only* that Faith and Works must be together in this Affair, (let any say what they will to the contrary ;) but *also*, that *St. Paul's* Deeds of the Law are not and cannot be the same with *St. James's* Works ; because then, by your own Concession, they could not be reconcil'd.

I shall therefore *in the first Place*, examine what you have offered against my Interpretation of the Apostle *James* in the Passage we are concerned with, viz. *That a Man is justified by Works and not by Faith only*; upon the true Interpretation of which this whole Controversy turns.

Your Opinion seems to be, "That the Apostle *James* speaks here of a manifestative or *evidential* Justification, i. e. whereby our Justification in the Sight of God becomes satisfactorily evident to our own Consciences and to the World, and shall be made apparent to Men and Angels at the last Day." As you give it in Pag. 23. Where you also own, "That you think not very diversly from those Divines who have expressed their Thoughts something after the Manner as I had represented them, viz. That St. *James* speaks of the Justification of our Faith before Men." And you endeavour to shew, how both these Interpretations come to one and the same Thing; you say, "They and we agree well enough." Who, *Gentlemen*, do you agree with? For there are ~~two~~ Sorts of Writers you here speak of: *Some* who have expressed their Thoughts much after the Manner as I had represented them, viz. That St. *James* speaks concerning the Justification of our Faith before Men; And *some* who go further and say, *before God as well as Men*,--- understanding the Justification here spoken of to mean, the Believers Approbation.---And by Faith only they understand a Faith that consists in naked Assent, or meer Profession." Do both these Interpretations come to the same Thing? Is it the same Thing to say, "'Tis the Office of Faith only to justify our Persons in the Sight of God; and 'tis the Office of good Works to shew unto Men that our Faith is justifying;" (which is the Interpretation I opposed;) and to say, "The Apostle *James* speaks concerning the Justification of our Faith before Men; and *before God also*, meaning the Believer's Approbation?"

If you agree with both these Sorts of Writers, how comes it to pass that you differ with me? For the *latter* of these Interpretations is exactly the same with that which I had given. All that I contended for in my Sermon was, that the true and genuine Fruits of a real, unfeigned Assent to divine and revealed Truths (which are what St. *James* calls Works,) are necessary to our being accepted and *approved* of God: At the same Time allowing, that these Fruits of Faith, or good Works do also justify, or evidence our Faith to Men.---What I could not

not

not persuade my self to believe was, That it is the *principal* Office of good Works to justify our Faith to Men ; or to convince and satisfy the World, that our Faith is genuine and of the right Stamp. I thought we had a further Concern in obeying the Commands of God, and in *living soberly, righteously, and godly in the World*, than merely to make our Profession of a justifying Faith in Christ *credible*. I thought we were to aim *ultimately* and *principally* at the divine Approbation and Acceptance in all our Endeavours of a religious Nature ; and that the approving of our selves to Men was a lower, inferior Motive. In a Word, I thought, as you say these Divines do, That when St. *James* pleads the Necessity of good Works in Order to Justification, he means not only the Justification of our Faith before Men, but before God also, “ before God as well as Men,” meaning the Believer’s Approbation.

These Divines therefore agreeing with me, with whom you differ so much, I presume you would not be thought to agree with them, (though you really express your selves as if you would) but with some other Divines, who go not so far, and are wont to express their Thoughts much after the Manner as I had represented them.

I wish, *Gentlemen*, you had not here laboured under great Confusion of Thought : For I would fain know your Minds, if I could. --- Do you hold that *Works* (in St. *James*’s Sense,) are necessary to our being accepted and approved of God, and publicly acknowledged and acquitted by him in the Day of Judgment ? If you do ; I would have no Contention with you in this Matter. --- But why then do you say, “ That it is *Faith* and that *only* which *justifies* in the most important Sense of the Term ? * ” Is there any more important Sense of the Term *justified* than that of our being approved of God, and owned and saved by him in the last Day ? ‡ Why do you say, † “ We are of Opinion, that when the Apostle *Paul* saith, “ *A Man is justified by Faith without the Deeds of the Law*, he means nothing less than that Act of God’s free Grace wherein he pardons all our Sins and accepteth us as righteous in his Sight, &c. Whereas when the Apostle *James* affirms,

* I agree entirely with the worthy *Professor* in P. 21. “ That we may doubtless with full as much Propriety be said to be justified, when we shall publicly be acknowledged and acquitted by God in the Day of Judgment, as when we were pardoned and treated by him as righteous Persons in the present Life.”

† Page 1. ‡ Page 18.

“ That a Man is justified by Works ; he is rather to be understood of a manifestative or evidential Justification ; viz. whereby our Justification in the Sight of God thro’ Christ’s Righteousness imputed and received by Faith, becomes satisfactorily evidenced, &c ? And again, * Neither indeed are the Works which he here recommends,” (i. e. which St. James recommends when he says, Chap. 2. v. 14. *What doth it profit, my Brethren, though a Man say he hath Faith, and hath not Works ? Can Faith save him ?* “ Neither indeed, say you, are these Works) justifying or saving, unless relatively, or rather argumentatively consider’d ; i. e. as evidential of that internal and cordial Acceptance of Christ to which Salvation doth really belong ?”

If I can guess at your Opinion from these Passages, it is really not very different from that, which I meant to expose in my Sermon ; viz. The Opinion, That the Apostle James was speaking only of the Justification of our Faith before Men. I freely acknowledg’d, I could not be of this Mind ; but tho’t he was treating of the same great and important Justification, which (I imagined) the Apostle Paul likewise had ultimately in View, namely, that of our being acquitted and approved of God in the last Day.† And I gave divers Reasons, why I so thought ; which are, as you have cited them, as follows,

“ 1. Because both the Apostles produce the same Instances of justified Persons.” To this you reply,‡ “ That for your Part you are not sensible of the Force of this Argument.” Answer, (alluding to a Passage of yours with Respect to me, in the next Page) perhaps if you had taken as much Pains to see, that there was some Weight in this Argument, as you may have taken to be sensible of none, you might have been of another Mind. I did not mention it as an Argument by itself alone conclusive, or carrying the Evidence of Demon-

* Page 23.

† For I suppose the Apostle Paul might speak of Christians as being justified now, much in the same Sense, in which he often speaks of them elsewhere as being saved ; as being quickned together with Christ, and raised up together, and made to sit together in heavenly Places ; and as being already come to Mount Zion, the City of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, &c. i. e. as being in the Way to these Things in their most proper and fullest Sense.

‡ Page 23.

stration. I mentioned it as it were *by the By* ; saying, ‘ Besides that they both produce the same Instances of justified Persons.

You suppose, “ It is the *one* Instance of *Abraham* that I “ refer to, for you don’t find *Rahab* mentioned by *Paul* with “ this View, though she is by *St. James*.” Answer, She is mentioned by *Paul* in his Epistle to the *Hebrews* as well as *Abraham*, v. 31. of Chap. 11. *By Faith the Harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the Spies with Peace.* And by *James* she is mentioned in the same Way of Opposition to *Paul* that *Abraham* is. *Likewise also was not Rahab the Harlot justified by Works when she had received the Messengers, and had sent them out another Way ?* Chap. 2. of his Epistle, ver. 25. From whence I argue, that what one calls *Faith*, the other calls *Works* ; each of them including in the Expression he uses, not only an Assent to the Truth, but a suitable correspondent Behaviour.---- But had it been only, “ Since the same *Abraham* is mentioned by *Paul*, as an Instance “ of Justification by Faith without Works ; and by *James* as “ an Example of Justification by Works ;” yet still it would have been to me a probable Argument, that they both intended the same Justification. For there is evidently an *Opposition* design’d in the Expression ; and it is not so likely that *St. James*’s Readers should think of reconciling him with *St. Paul*, by putting a different Sense upon the Word which they both use alike, as upon the other Words to which the Opposition would naturally turn their Thoughts : Especially when the Words *Faith* and *Works* are more common ; and are used in a greater Variety of Signification ; and in a Multitude of other Places, do certainly each include the other ; whereas the Word *justified* is more appropriate, and seems to be a Kind of technical Term.

Further, When One of them says, a Man is *justified by Faith*, and the Other, a Man is *justified by Works* ; the Words *Faith* and *Works* do in this Case almost unavoidably catch the Mind, hang in it, and engage the Attention to them : So that any one would, at least in the first Place, seek their Reconciliation by supposing that they may use these Words in such a Sense as to intend the same Thing.

But you say, “ You see not why the same Person whom one “ Apostle declares to have been really justified in the Sight “ of God *by an Act of Grace* ; may not with Propriety eno’ “ be affirm’d by another Apostle, to be declaratively or evidentially

“ dentially justified also.” I suppose, *Gentlemen*, you would have said, You don’t see why the same Person whom one Apostle declares to have been really justified in the Sight of God by Faith, may not with Propriety enough be affirm’d by another Apostle, to have been declaratively or evidentially justified in the Sight of Men by Works ; but only that you are a little ashamed of that Way of speaking : Though you would not be thought to differ very much from those Divines who use it. For my Part, I think there is as little Decency in the Way of speaking you have here chosen, as in the other. For you intimate, that though *Paul’s* Justification by Faith, is by an Act of Grace ; yet *James’s* Justification by Works, and not by Faith only, is not so : Which I believe the Apostle *James* would not have taken very well at your Hands. For there is no Reason (I think) to imagine but that he detested the Thought of any other Justification of a Sinner than by Grace, as much as *St. Paul*. Certainly he was not leading Men to go about to establish their own Righteousness, or to seek Justification as it were by Works of the Law, as *St. Paul* uses those Phrases. I hold with the Apostle *James*, that we are justified by Works, and not by Faith only ; but then I believe, that this Justification is by the freest Grace, and through the alone Merit of Jesus Christ.

I had objected 2. ‘ That *St. James* uses the Word *saved* as well as *justified*.’ ver. 14. *Can Faith save him ?* “ But what I would argue from this, (you say) you are utterly “ at a Loss.” I will tell you then ; I argue from it, that *St. James* is speaking of that Justification of a Sinner, which is nearly and closely connected with his Salvation ; and not meerly of his Justification in the Sight of Men. Had *St. James* been treating only of a manifestative or evidential Justification, and not of the great and important Justification which includes Remission of Sins, &c. his Question here would be, Can Faith save his Credit ? Or at most, with the Addition to this Interpretation which you have made, it would be, Can it save his Comfort and Credit ? The Comfort of his own Mind, and his Credit now, and in the last Day before Men and Angels. Which is a Sense in which I believe, the Word *saved* is no where else used in Scripture. Nor can it be so taken here by any sober Person (I should think) that will be at the Pains to look into the Context. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the Law of Liberty.

For

For he shall have Judgment without Mercy that hath shewed no Mercy. What doth it profit, my Brethren, though a Man say he hath Faith, and have not Works? Can Faith save him? Can it save his Soul in the Day of the Lord Jesus? Will it interest him in the Mercy of God and the Merits of Christ, so that he shall be publickly acknowledged and acquitted in the Day of Judgment?

But you say, "We readily allow, that the Faith which the Apostle is here speaking of so disparagingly, is not a saving Faith, but a fruitless Profession and Boast of Faith." In this, Gentlemen, I must needs say, I think you are mistaken: For tho' the Faith which this Apostle speaks of, is not, without Works, saving, yet it is not a fruitless Profession and Boast of Faith. It is a real Faith and a right Faith. i. e. of Assent. Ver. 19. *Thou believest there is one God, thou dost well.* So, thou believest that Jesus is the Christ; thou dost well. Thou believest every Truth of natural and revealed Religion; thou dost well.---And that it is added, *The Devils also believe, and tremble,* is no Argument against this, but a Confirmation of it. For is the Faith of the Devils in the Instance mentioned a fruitless Profession and Boast of Faith? Or, is it real? Undoubtedly real; why else do they tremble?

Nor does the Apostle speak disparagingly of this Faith consider'd in its self, but only when consider'd as the Condition of the Gospel-Covenant; or as a Ground whereon to entertain the Hope of Salvation, without Works. Hence his Reply is not, *Wilt thou know, O vain Man,* that thy Faith is a fruitless Profession and Boast of Faith? But it is, *Wilt thou know, that Faith without Works is dead:* 'Be thy Assent to divine Truths ever so real, ever so well grounded, yet if it produce not the proper Effects in thy Heart and Life, it will not avail thee to any saving Advantage.'

You add, "Neither indeed are the Works which he here recommends justifying or saving, unless relatively or rather argumentatively considered, i. e. as evidential of that internal and cordial Acceptance of Christ to which Salvation doth really belong." This, Gentlemen, is what you should have proved.---And do you imagine, that your bare Affirmation in this Case is sufficient to answer my Objection? If neither the Faith, nor Works of this Apostle, either separately or together, are saving, how comes it to pass that he uses the Word *saved* in the very Introduction of this Discourse? Why does he ask the Question, *Can Faith without Works save a Man?*

This I should think, alone might be sufficient to take off the Odium of your first Charge, " That I join Works with Faith as the Method or Condition of our receiving and becoming entitled to Christ's justifying Merits;" Since wherever I do this, I speak of the Works and Faith of *this* Apostle; and not of the Faith and Works of the Apostle *Paul*; with which only you oppose me: Nor do I join them otherwise than this Apostle here does, viz, As on our Part the Condition of obtaining Salvation, through the Mercy of God, and the Merits of Jesus Christ.

But it seems, you don't think the Apostle is here speaking of *Salvation* at all.---You should then, *Gentlemen*, have clearly and solidly answered my Argument, and have shewn what the Apostle meant by using the Word *saved*, when he was treating of no such Thing; instead of professing your selves at a Loss what I would argue from this Passage. For as my Objection now stands, with your Answer, any Body may see, that your being at a Loss what I would argue from this Passage, was only your not knowing very well what to say to it.

I had objected 3. ' That in the Text where the Apostle *James* is most opposite to the Apostle *Paul*, it is impossible to understand him as speaking of the Justification of our Faith in the Sight of Men, and make Sense and Truth of what he says. For according to this Interpretation it would be, Ye see then how that by Works a Man's Faith is justified in the Sight of Men, and not by Faith only: Which, besides the Obscurity and Barbarity of the Expression, would imply, that a Man's Faith might be justified in the Sight of Men partly by his Faith without any Fruits or Effects appearing in his Life and Conversation.' This you have cited; but have you said one Word to remove the Objection? Not one Word; unless it is, " That you verily believe, If I had taken the same Pains to find out the Meaning of those Divines who say, that St. *James* intends the Justification of our Faith in the Sight of Men, and to set it in a fair Light, which I have taken to make it absurd, I should have found it consistent enough with Sense, if not with Truth also." To which I reply, You have then a much greater Opinion of my Abilities, than my Experience will allow me to have: For I have tried my utmost to remove this Objection, and I cannot do it any other Way than by gradually working my self out of Sight of it: I cannot reconcile this Interpretation of St.

St. *James* with good Sense.---And I heartily wish, *Gentlemen*, you had made Proof of your own far superior Abilities in attempting to do it.---And indeed I think it concern'd you so to have done ; for your own Interpretation which you acknowledge is not much different (and should not have been different at all, to have had your Remarks upon my Sermon pertinent) is, in my Opinion, liable to the same Objection ; and intangled with the same Want of good Sense in the Words which you so interpret.

According to your Interpretation (when you have mended it to your Minds, and made it as defensible as you can,) St. *James* is speaking of a manifestative or evidential Justification : And this he says, is *by Works, and not by Faith only* ; implying that it is *in Part* by Faith, as well as by Works. Now take Faith in what Sense you please (in Contradistinction from Works) either for the Assent of the Mind to revealed Truths, (according to St. *James*) or for a *good Principle within*, a Principle of Holiness and Virtue, (as it seems to be sometimes taken in your *Remarks*,) or for any Act, or Acts of the Will, or internal Workings of the Soul whatsoever ; it can in no Sense be said to be manifestative or evidential of its self to others, unless by some Fruits or Effects appearing from it in the outward Life. And therefore according to this Interpretation of St. *James*, his Words would imply ‘ what was contrary to ‘ that of our Saviour, That *the Tree is known by his Fruit* ; and ‘ contrary to the whole Tenor of Scripture and the common ‘ Reason of Mankind : Both which agree, that a Man’s Faith ‘ cannot be justified or evidenced at all to others by its self, ‘ but only by its visible Fruits and Effects, i. e. in other Words, ‘ by his Works. So that if this had been the Apostle’s Meaning, he would have said, Ye see then how that by Works ‘ only a Man is justified, and not by Faith *at all* ;’ as I had drawn out my Objection more largely, than you were pleased to cite it.

I would omit Nothing in your Answer, that I can perceive to have the least Aspect upon my Objection. You have cited indeed considerable here from Dr. *Manton*, (a very worthy Divine) which I don’t think it needful to transcribe ; because I think it was Nothing to your Purpose. For I was not at a Loss about the *Meaning* of those Divines, but how to reconcile the Meaning which they sometimes put upon the Apostle *James*’s Words, with Truth and good Sense ; as I had expressed it in my Objection. And to this I find nothing, ei-
ther

ther in what you have cited from others, or said your selves, more than I have already consider'd ; unless it be that you prefer your own Way of expressing St. James's Sense before that which my Objection was levelled against, " Because this " Method of Expression seems more clear and less liable to " Cavils." But (with Submission) I think, I have shewn, that your own Way of interpreting St. James is liable (not to the same Cavils, but) to the same weighty Objections with the others. You have not mended the Matter at all with Respect to the *present* Objection ; unless it be, that instead of using a Method of Expression more clear, you have chosen one vastly more *obscure* and *intricate* ; and so might hope, that by entangling the Matter and getting the Reader into the Dark, the Objection might be lost Sight of : Which yet any one of ordinary Attention and Capacity may recover.----But indeed, *Gentlemen*, I think, you should either have defended the Interpretation, which I opposed in my Sermon ; or have let my Sermon alone. If that Interpretation was *defensible*, why seek you out a new one ? And if it was not ; why might I not shew it ; and so lead you and others to a better ?

I proceeded in my Sermon, saying, ' The Apostle very well ' knew that the Justification of our Faith, or of any Thing ' else meerly in the Sight of Men, was not a Thing of great ' Importance.' Of this you thus write, " Another Objection " of Mr. Balch's against this Interpretation of St. James, not " a little surprizeth us ; it occurs in the same 6th Page, ' The " Apostle very well knew, ' &c." I am sorry, *Gentlemen*, that this Objection (expressed, I think, very modestly) should put you into any Disorder. Perhaps had you looked forward to the End of the Period, you might have seen, that there was some Weight in it ; ' Since what is highly esteemed amongst Men may yet be an Abomination in the Sight of ' God.

My Intention was to argue after this Manner ; if St. James's Works are only to justify our Faith in the Sight of Men ; which is the Interpretation, I was opposing) if this is the Office of good Works, what we are to aim at, and all that we are to expect from them ; then the *Pharisees* were very right, who did all their Works to be seen of Men. They design'd the proper End of good Works, and attain'd it : For their outward Appearance was *beautiful*, they were justified in the Sight of Men.----And yet, what did all this avail them, since though they

they were highly esteemed among Men, they were notwithstanding an Abomination in the Sight of God ? So that if this End could be attained by Works (and it might be attained by hypocritical and counterfeit Appearances of Goodness, as well as by the most real and solid Vertues, since Men cannot see into the Heart ; their Eye pierces not beyond the outward Appearance ;) yet it is not a Thing of any Importance ; and so was utterly unfit to be supposed the *Subject* an inspired Apostle was treating of, and pressing in so solemn a Manner.

This was my Objection ; and what have you said to remove it ? Your whole Answer is as follows, “ And are then “ the having it manifested to our own Consciences and Fellow-Christians, that we are thro’ *Faith* pardoned of God, made “ *accepted in and thro’ the Beloved* ; or our having him testifying “ of us publicly before the World ; and God’s finally before “ Angels and Men at the great Day declaring and pronouncing “ us justified by Faith and producing our good Works as Evidences to vindicate our Sincerity and his Justice ; are “ these, (we say) Things of trifling Moment, and unworthy “ to be treated of by an Apostle ? And yet this is what they “ mean, who insist that St. *James* speaks concerning the Justification of our Faith before Men.”

And do you indeed, *Gentlemen*, believe, that all this is included in the Expression, *Our Justification before Men* ? Are, justifying our selves before Men, and God’s justifying us at the last Day, *one* and the same Thing ; so that whenever the *former* of these is pressed, the *latter* will necessarily be understood, as included in it ? Should you exhort a Person to take Care to approve himself to Men ; to behave so as to justify himself in the Sight of Men ; will he readily apprehend you to mean, that he should take Care to approve himself to God, and be sure to behave so, as that God may justify him in the last Day ? Certainly these Things are very different one from the other ; and may be, and too often are in Fact separated. The *Pharisees* justify’d themselves before Men ; as you might have seen in the Text refer’d to, in my Objection, Luke 16. 15. *Ye are they which justify your selves before Men ; but God knoweth your Hearts. For that which is highly esteemed among Men, is Abomination in the Sight of God.* Cannot a Person by seeming good Works make his Profession of a justifying Faith in Christ credible to the World, and yet for Want of *real* good Works, not be publicly acknowledged and acquitted by God

in the Day of Judgment ? Why then do you confound these Things together ?

Is it the same Thing to aim at the approving of our selves to Men, and at the approving of our selves to God ? Is it the same, to seek Honour one of another, as the Pharisees did ; and to seek that Honour which cometh from God only, which they neglected ? If it is the Office of good Works only to justify our Faith to Men, or to make our Profession of a justifying Faith credible ; the Pharisees, as I before observed, ought to have been commended. For had they looked further, had they aim'd at the pleasing of God, and the approving themselves in his Sight, they would have done what was very wrong ; they would have expected that from their Obedience to the Commands of God, which did not belong to Obedience but only to Faith.

And what Room is there left, according to this Interpretation of the Apostle, for the Exercise of any Christian Duty in secret ? Are Men to go into their Closets, and shut the Door, and pray to their Father in secret, to justify their Faith in the Sight of Men, or to render their Profession of a justifying Faith credible ? Is it the Way to justify our Faith to Men in the Exercise of Alms, not to let our left Hand know what our right Hand does ? Or in the keeping of Fasts, to anoint the Head and wash the Face, that we appear not unto Men to fast ? Nay ; according to this Interpretation, I don't see that you leave a Foundation for the Exercise of any real and sincere Obedience at all ; forasmuch as the great End may be answer'd as well by the mere outward Appearance.

And is it the same Thing to be justified by Men ; nay, to have the Approbation of Men and Angels, and of our own Consciences ; (is this the same) with the Approbation of God, the supreme unerring Judge, and to be justified by him ? The Apostle Paul did not think so ; (any more than the Apostle James) 1 Cor. 4. 3, 4. *With me (says he) it is a very small Thing that I should be judged of you or of Man's Judgment: Yea, I judge not mine own self. For though I know Nothing by myself, yet am I not hereby justified ; but he that judgeth me is the Lord.* He esteemed the Judgment of Man a Thing of small Moment ; nay, and even the Approbation of his own Mind in Comparison of his being justified of God.

If you include any Thing in your Answer, as what the Apostle James treats of, more than the Justification of our Faith in the Sight of Men ; so far you come into my Interpretation :

So

So far, instead of removing my Objection, you concede to the Force of it.---And if you intend no more than what is naturally and properly express'd in the *Justification* of our Faith in the Sight of Men, as you seem to intimate in the Close, I then say very freely, *It is of trifling Moment, and utterly unworthy to be supposed the Subject, which an inspired Apostle treats of in so rousing and solemn a Manner.*

I readily allow, that having it *manifested* to our Consciences and Fellow-Christians, that we are pardoned of God, (on the Exercise of a true Repentance through Faith, and are made accepted in and through the Beloved ; that this is a Thing in *its self* by no Means of trifling Moment ; but a very great and weighty Matter. Yet nevertheless, the *Manifestation* of this to our own Consciences and Fellow-Christians, is an infinite Trifle in Comparison with the Thing *its self*, our being pardoned of God, and being made accepted in and thro' the Beloved.

These Things are distinct and separable: And tho' the *former* consider'd in its self, is a great Thing ; yet it is Nothing, and less than Nothing and Vanity in Compare with the *latter*: Or in Compare with what you next add, " Having God to testify of us publickly, and before Angels and Men at the great Day declaring and pronouncing us justified."

This, *Gentlemen*, is the very Thing which I call *Justification*, in the most important Sense of the Term ; and is no more different from the former, than our being justified by God, is from our being justified by Men.

I can't therefore, in my Turn, help expressing my *Surprise*, that you should chuse to answer my Objection in such a Way.---My Objection was, That the Justification of our Faith merely in the Sight of Men, was not a Thing of so great Importance, that we could reasonably suppose it to be the Subject of St. James's Epistle, or of that Part of it which contains his Discourse about Justification. No ! say you, " Is it not of great Importance to have God publickly testifying of us, and before Men and Angels at the great Day declaring and pronouncing us pardoned and justified ?" Why, Yes, *Gentlemen*, this is acknowledged to be of infinite Importance, and is the very Thing, that I plead good Works are necessary for, and suppose, that St. James is treating of ; in a Conformity with all the rest of the Bible: That in the last Day God will bring every Work into Judgment, &c.

But how is this included in the Justification of our Faith in the Sight of Men ?

Why,

Why you say, " Our good Works will be produc'd as Evidences to vindicate our Sincerity and God's Justice, while we are pronounc'd pardon'd and justified by Faith." But how do this appear, *Gentlemen* ? Do you meet with it any where in *Scripture*, That in the great Day Men's Faith will first be produc'd, and they be pronounc'd pardon'd and justified by it ; and then that their Repentance and New Obedience, or their good Works, will be brought in only as Evidences to Angels and Men of the Sincerity of their Faith, and of the Justice of the divine Sentence ? Are Men and Angels better capable of judging of the Sincerity of Repentance and Obedience, than they are of Faith ? And does not God, who knows the one of these, equally know the other ; and is he not equally capable of making them known ?---For my own Part, I believe, That the Assent Men have given to divine Truths, and the Effects it has had upon their Hearts and Lives, in one Instance and another, will be brought into Judgment ; And that, if they have obeyed the Truth, as well as believed it ; they will be justified freely by the Grace of God through the Redemption that there is in Jesus Christ.----- But I must not enlarge.

Having thus consider'd what you have offered in your Remarks, in Answer to the several Objections, which I had intimated in my Sermon, against the Interpretation of St. James. of the Justification of our Faith in the Sight of Men : And having (I think) shewn, that you have not clearly and solidly removed any one of my Objections ; I should now proceed to consider what you have offered, on the other Hand, in Support of that Interpretation, but only that I find, you have not laboured the Point.

The most, and indeed all that I meet with in your Remarks to this Purpose, is, what occurs in P. 18. in these Words ; " Mr. Balch knows well enough, that this Solution (this Solution of Paul's speaking of a real, and James of an evidential Justification ; or, that Paul speaks of the Justification of our Persons in the Sight of God, and James of the Justification of our Faith in the Sight of Men) is not our own Invention ; but that it hath perhaps as often been offered, as the Objection (i. e. the Objection of a Contradiction in the Writings of these two Apostles) hath been made."

To which I need only reply, That it is nothing with me, whose Invention this or that is, if it be but the Truth ; and that

that I should have liked this as well, if it had been your Invention, or the Invention of either of you, as of any other Man.

You have cited indeed divers worthy Persons, as being, or seeming to be of the same Mind with you. But as Men's Minds are different at different Times; and they may express themselves differently upon various Occasions, when upon the whole, their Minds are much the same; saying sometimes, that St. *James* speaks of the Justification of our Faith in the Sight of Men, and at other Times (as you acknowledge) going further and saying, "Before God as well as Men,---meaning the Believer's Approbation;" and as it is but equal and fair, that any, who are opposed, should have Opportunity to explain and vindicate themselves, (all Men being liable to misapprehend, or misrepresent the Sense of others, which sometimes they *themselves only* are capable of rectifying :) For these, and other like Reasons, I shall take no further Notice of your *Quotations* here, than only to say, That though I have a Veneration generally for the *Authors* you have cited, and in particular for the present worthy Professor, (who by his late valuable *Piece* in Opposition to the *Itinerancy* is fixed in the Esteem of the sober Part of the Country; (yet I must be excus'd, if no Names of Men whatever will sway with me against the clear Evidence of Truth.

I shall therefore propose an Objection or two, which I have further against this Interpretation of the Apostle *James*, and so leave it.

I argue thus,

If St. *James* is speaking only of a manifestative or evidential Justification by Works, i. e. of a Justification whereby it is manifest and evident to ourselves and others, that we have a justifying Faith and are in a good Estate; then it will follow, that the *Faith* he is speaking of, is a justifying Faith; and that the Person who has it, is in a safe and good Estate; contrary to the whole Design and Tenor of his Discourse. Nothing can prove a Thing to be, which is not: Nothing can prove a Man to have a justifying Faith, who has not a justifying Faith, or to be in a good Estate, who is not in a good Estate. Consequently, it can't be the Design of this Apostle to press Works for this End, "to prove that a Man's Faith is of the right Kind, and that he is in a good Estate." I grant "that according to a common Usage of Speech, we may be said to be justified by that which evidences our

“ Case to be good, as well as by that which makes it good. But this reaches not the Case of St. *James* : The Persons he is speaking to wanted to have their Case *made* good, as well as to be proved to be so ; and yet he only presses them to *Works*. If therefore instead of saying, “ That *Works* are “ necessary to prove a Man’s Faith to be of the right Kind ; you had said, to make it to be so ; (that by *Works* his Faith was MADE perfect, as *James* himself expressly says) I could readily have agreed with you ; taking Faith & Works in the Sense of this Apostle.---And I am persuaded, that taking *Faith* in the Sense of this Apostle, you do not think the Man that has it, is in a good Estate : You allow that he is not. How then is it possible, that *Works* should prove him to be in a good Estate, if they do not also first make his Estate to be good ? How is it possible that they should prove his Faith to be of the right Kind, when it is not ; unless by their Addition they first make it to be so ?---The Foundation of your whole Mistake in this Matter, is this, that you put *Paul’s* Faith, and *James’s* Works together ; *Paul’s* Faith, I acknowledge (or “a good Principle within,” i. e. as I understand you, a renewed and sanctified Temper and Frame of Soul) is the Condition of our Acceptance with God, or by this, through Christ, we are brought into a State of Grace and Favour with God. And taking *Works* for a Man’s outward Behaviour and Actions ; these only prove a good Principle within, they do not *make* the good Principle, but *flow* from it. But then this is not the Sense of Faith and Works in the Apostle *James* ; as indeed you abundantly allow, though you as often forget it. His Faith of *Assent* must be made good by his Works (which include the Faith of Consent, and all that you intend by a justifying, saving Faith in Christ) before it can possibly be *proved* to be so by any Works whatever. Consequently, he cannot be speaking only of a manifestative or evidential Justification.

Once more,

If St. *James* is speaking only of a manifestative or evidential Justification by Works, i. e. of a Justification whereby it is manifest and evident to our selves and others, that we have a justifying Faith and are in a good Estate ; then it will follow, that he makes the *Manifestation* or Evidence of our having a justifying Faith and of our being in a good Estate, of unspeakably greater Importance than the Thing its self : Contrary to all Reason and Truth. For no Body living can imagine,

gine, or will dare to say, That the Evidence to our own Consciences and to the World, that we are through Christ in a good Estate, pardoned and accepted of God, and entitled to eternal Happiness, (I say, that the Evidence of this to ourselves and others) is of greater Importance than the Thing its self; when indeed it is nothing, and less than nothing and Vanity, in Comparison with our being in such a Condition: And yet according to this Interpretation, an *inspired* Apostle would say it. For let the Reader observe; according to you, Faith brings us into a good Estate; to this say you, *Salvation really belongs*; Works are to manifest it to our selves and others. And yet, in the Language and Similitude of this Apostle, Works are the *Soul*, and Faith is but the *Body*; or an empty, dead, Carcase, without the former, altogether *unprofitable and vain*. So that he would say, "Though Faith will secure you of the Favour of God and eternal Life, yet because it will not make it evident to yourselves and others, that you are in this happy Case, it is of Nothing worth; for, as much as the Soul is preferable to the Body, or a living, immortal Spirit, to an empty, dead Carcase, of so much greater Importance it is, that by Works we make it evident to our selves and others, that we are in a safe and happy Condition, than it is, that by Faith we should attain to it, of so much more Worth are the Ease and Quiet of our own Minds, and the Credit and Applause of Men and Angels, than the Pardon and Favour of God, and that *Salvation which there is in Christ Jesus with eternal Glory!*" Which is so absurd and monstrous, that I shall never believe it of any *inspired* Writer. *Let God be true, though all Men be Liars.*

I must therefore think, (till I am shewn better, till my Objections are fairly answered, and these Difficulties are removed) that the Apostle *James* treats of the same *real*, great and important Justification, which the Apostle *Paul* treats of. ---- And if so; then it clearly follows, 'not only that Faith and Works must be together in this Affair, let any say what they will to the contrary;' (which is a full Answer to your *first* Charge, *That I join Works with Faith, &c.*) but also, that *St. Paul's Deeds of the Law*, are not, and cannot be the same with *St. James's Works*; because then, by your own Concession, they could not be reconcil'd.

I therefore now proceed to the Consideration of that other Text, Rom. 3. 28. "Which, you say, I have strenuously laboured,

"boured, to make speak favourably of my Opinion, but will
 "after all that I have done, be an eternal Confutation of it.
 "For it asserts, that a Man is *justified by Faith without the*
 "*Deeds of the Law*: Which Deeds of the Law, (say you)
 "we hope in the Sequel to prove to be none other than those
 "Works to which Mr. Balch (it should have been, to which
 "St. James) attributes our Justification. So that the Apostle
 "Paul and he will appear to have had very different Senti-
 "ments with Respect to Justification." P. 7. of your Remarks.
 I am willing the Matter should be examined thoroughly; and
 though I take no Notice of your *humane Authorities*, yet I
 shall omit no Reasoning contained in them, which you have
 any Way couched in what follows next after their Quo-
 tation.

You begin again with this Text in P. 14. and after charg-
 ing me with offering Violence to sacred Scripture, (I believe
 it will appear to be without Foundation) you say, "We think
 "it plain, that he hath forcibly shut the Mouth of that Word
 "which we esteem our Oracle, that it should not condemn
 "his Justification by Works. For whereas the Apostle Paul
 "hath said, Rom. 3. 28. That a Man is *justified by Faith with-*
 "*out the Deeds of the Law*; Mr. Balch thinks he hath for-
 "ever silenc'd this Testimony for Justification by Faith alone,
 "by affirming, that the Law meant by the Apostle, is the ce-
 "remonial Law, not the moral." There are two *Mistakes* in
 this Passage, which it mayn't be amiss to rectify, as we go along.

One is, that I think, I have silenced this Testimony for *Justi-*
fication by Faith alone. It is no such Thing. I acknowledge
 this is a Testimony for Justification by Faith alone, and preach
 it, and plead it, as such, as much as you do; taking *Faith* in the
 Sense of this Apostle. I only deny that we are justified by
 Faith alone when it is taken in a Sense opposite to the Apostle
 James. I believe, that as soon as a Man becomes a *sincere*
Christian, i. e. as soon as *believing the Gospel, he truly repents of*
his past Sins, and turns from them to God, casting himself upon the
Mercy of God in Christ, his Heart being renewed and changed, &c.
 he is received into a State of Grace and Favour with God:
 And that if he should die before he has Opportunity to bring
 forth those *external good Works*, which if he lives, will cer-
 tainly be the Fruit and Consequence of this his *inwardly re-*
newed and sanctified Frame of Mind, he will yet be justified
 in the last Day, and have eternal Life bestowed upon him.

This

This I had sufficiently (as I thought) expressed in my Sermon, P. 10. ‘ No Faith is so, (i. e. is acceptable to God) which produces not a Disposition and Resolution of universal, chearful Compliance with the divine Will ;’ intimating that when it has done so much as this, the Person now becomes acceptable to God. As will farther appear in what follows, P. 11. ‘ Those who have such a Faith in what God has revealed, as to be put upon doing what he requires, in order to their escaping the Wrath to come, and obtaining everlasting Life: These, I say, have the Faith and Works which this Apostle (St. James) speaks of: When their Faith has brought them truly to repent of all their past Sins, and to cast themselves upon the Mercy of God in Christ for Pardon, with a sincere, unfeigned Resolution of new and better Obedience for the future; which Resolution is accordingly put in Practice, as God is pleased to give them Time and Opportunity for it ;’ (Nor dare I give Men Leave to hope for the Favour of God and eternal Life upon lower Terms.) ‘ We are not to imagine that when any are brought thus far, if God should be pleased to remove them out of the World at this Juncture, they have not the *Works* of this Apostle. These are not to be measured by their Number, but by their Nature, and the Time and Opportunity, and other Advantages which God is pleased to vouchsafe in order to their Performance.’ And again, in the *Application*, P. 26. ‘ If at other Times you hear *Faith* spoken of as the *Condition of the Gospel-Covenant*, and Believers pronounced in ‘ a safe State, &c.’ so that as St. Paul uses the *Word*, I acknowledge we are justified by *Faith* alone; or that it is the Condition of the Gospel-Covenant, &c. and consequently, could have no Thought of *silencing this Testimony for such a Justification*.

Which, by the Way, may also serve for an Answer to those several *human Testimonies* which you have brought for the same Thing: Forasmuch as it is reasonably to be supposed, that when they assert our *Justification by Faith alone*, they intend it in the Sense of St. Paul, (upon whose Language their Doctrine is plainly built) and not in Opposition to St. James; after whom I had no less visibly copied in my Sermon; being concern’d that his Doctrine should be thoroughly understood, as it was to be hoped, St. Paul’s already was.

And therefore though you affirm, P. 9. “ That my Doctrine is contrary to, and stands condemn’d by the *Articles* of

“ of the Church of England, and the *Westminster* and New-
 “ *England Confessions* ;” yet I believe, upon a thorough Ex-
 amination of Matters, (could any valuable End be served
 thereby) it might be easily shewn, That my Sermon and those
human Forms differ only as the two Apostles St. Paul and St.
 James differ ; and may be reconciled upon the same Principles
 and in the same Way.

But what I am more affected with, is, your saying in the
 same Page, “ That the Divinity which is publicly taught in
 “ our Colleges is *diametrically* opposite to the Doctrine of my
 “ Sermon.” For which unaccountable Expression, I believe,
 the Rev. Professor will not give you his Thanks.----The Doc-
 trine of my Sermon is plainly this, that Men should *fear God*
and work Righteousness ; that they should *do justly*, and *love*
Mercy, and *walk humbly with God* ; that they should live *sober-*
ly, and *righteously*, and *godly in the World*, and not content
 themselves with *believing*, without *obeying the Truth* ; and in
 a Word, that they should be sincere, good Men, and hearty,
 thorough, resolved Christians, *in order to their entertaining the*
Hope of eternal Life. And good God ! (I speak it with Re-
 verence) what Doctrine must that be, which is *diametrically*
 opposite to this ? Your unreasonable Prejudice and Partiality
 and your unaccountable Uncharitableness and Bigotry herein,
 I am sure, deserve a sharper Rebuke than it will become me
 to give, and so I leave it.

The other Mistake you have made in the Passage above re-
 cited is, that I affirm, *The Law meant by the Apostle* (Rom. 3.
 28.) *is the ceremonial Law*. I never once affirm'd it ; but
 constantly say, the *Jewish Law*, the *Mosaic Law*, the *Law of*
Moses, or the like. This is evident in every one of your own
 Quotations ; which you say, you make “ That you might not
 “ be thought to wrong me in this Representation.” I will
 not therefore suppose this a wilful Mistake ; but conclude,
 you are willing it should stand thus, *That I affirm, the Law*
meant by the Apostle is the Jewish Law, not the moral.

But though I suppose that by the *Deeds of the Law* the A-
 postle intended the whole *Jewish* or *Mosaic Dispensation*,
 which was *disannuled*, or set aside to make Way for *Christian-*
ity, yet I very frequently mention the *Rites and Ceremonies* in
 particular, as what he meant to exclude from having any
 Thing to do in our Justification ; because the *Dispute*, which
 I imagine, was the Occasion of his writing this and some other
 of

of his *Epistles*, was particularly about the binding Obligation of These. The moral Law, it was well known, as the *Law of God to Man in his Creation*, was alike obliging upon all Mankind. Besides our *Saviour* had preached Morality, or the Duties and Obligation of this Law, as much as *Moses*, or any of the *Prophets* had done. So that tho' it ceased to oblige the *Disciples* of Christ, as it had been a *Part of the Jewish Law*, yet it was not only equally obligatory upon them with the rest of Mankind, as the Law of their *Nature*, the Law of God to Man in his Creation, but it moreover peculiarly obliged them as it was become a *Part of the Law of Christ*: And they could not in Reason think themselves not under its Obligation, any more than that they were not under any Obligation to believe in Christ, or to attend any other of the most peculiar Duties of Christianity. For this Reason (I say) the Dispute being in Effect only about the Obligation of the *Jewish Rites and Ceremonies*; I often instance in these particularly (as the Apostle also does) and yet all along by the Word *Law* understand the *Jewish Law*, which was moral as well as ceremonial; and by the Phrase *Deeds of the Law*, understand *Judaism*, or all Acts of Conformity whatever to the *Jewish Law* in any of the several Parts or Branches of it, considered as a Law that God once gave by *MOSES*, to the People of *ISRAEL*.

And being thus I hope, sufficiently understood, let us now proceed.

“ That this Gloss of Mr. Balch's (say you P. 15.) is a corrupt one, and a wresting the Scripture from its genuine Sense, we think is evident from what we have cited already from Mr. Professor's Manuscripts. For it may be easily remembered how he hath observed, &c.” That none may imagine the Rev. Professor has done more of this Kind, than he really has; I will cite at large the Passage from whence this is taken, Pag. 13. “ The Scriptures very particularly exclude Works of the moral Law, from such an Influence on our Justification, as they ascribe to Faith. The Truth of this, I think, will evidently appear to any Man who shall read the three first Chapters of the Epistle to the Romans with due Attention. For there he will find, that it is the Law of Nature or moral Law which is all along spoken of; and that they are the Deeds of this Law which the Apostle is so careful to exclude from that Concern in our Justification which he ascribes to Faith. It is the Law written on Men's Hearts, Rom. 2. 15. The Law which forbids Theft, Adultery,

" *Adultery, and Idolatry, v. 21, 22.* The Law by which is the
 " *Knowledge of Sin ; and by which all the World are become*
 " *guilty before God, Rom. 3. 19, 20. and no other, of which,*
 " *and its Deeds, the Apostle speaks.*" And it may be added,
 say you Pag. 15, " *That it is the Law which was not made*
void by Faith, but rather established by it, Rom. 3. 31."

These are your Arguments. You hold, it is the *moral* Law which is mean't by the Apostle in the Text we are upon, or the *Deeds* of which he is so careful to exclude from that Concern in our Justification which he ascribes to Faith,

1. " *Because the Law there spoken of, is the Law written in Men's Hearts.*" But how does this appear ? In *Rom. 2. 14, 15.* the Place refer'd to, the Apostle speaks of *two* Laws ; the written *Jewish* Law, which the *Gentiles* had not, and the Law of *Nature*, which was written in their Minds. And for all that appears, it may be the *former* of these, as likely as the latter, which he continues to discourse of down to the Text in Dispute. So that nothing in the least to your Purpose, can be argued from the Apostle's mentioning the Law of *Nature* in *Rom. 2. 15.* When in the *three foregoing Verses* he is plainly and evidently speaking of *another* Law, which the *Gentiles* *sinned without*, and which they *had not*.

But this Place is to my Purpose, though it be nothing to yours ; because the Apostle plainly distinguishes, as I do, between the Law of *Nature*, and the *Jewish* Law ; and does not distinguish, as you do, between the *moral* and *ceremonial* Parts of the same Law : As any Body may see that will be at the Pains to read those Verses.

2. Your next Argument is, That it must be the *moral* Law, " *Because it is the Law which forbade Theft, Adultery, and Idolatry, Rom. 2. 21, 22.*" Answer. Did not the *Jewish* Law forbid *Theft, Adultery, and Idolatry*, as well as the Law of *Nature*, or *moral* Law ? Then this Text is no more to your Purpose than the *former*.

And indeed it is plain to me, that it is the *Jewish* Law which is here all along spoken of, from the 17th v. down to the 25th, *inclusively*. Behold thou art called a *Jew*, and *restest in the Law, v. 17.* And v. 23. *Thou that makest thy Boast of the Law, through breaking the Law dishonourest thou God ?* Now what Law did the *Jew* rest in, and make his Boast of ? The *moral* Law, which was given to the *Jews* but in common with the rest of Mankind ? or, the Law of *Moses*, which was given

to them peculiarly? Undoubtedly the *latter*. If then, "It is plain, that the *Jew* dishonoured God by breaking the same Law that he boasted of;" as you say; it will follow, that it is the *Jewish* Law, and not the *moral*, that is spoken of in the 21st and 22d *Verses*, directly against your Argument.

3. And the same may be said of your Argument next following, viz. "That it is the Law by which was the Knowledge of Sin." For was not the *Jewish* Law (I don't mean the ceremonial Part in Opposition to the moral, but the whole Law given to the *Jews* by *Moses*; I say, was not this) adapted to give Men the Knowledge of Sin, even above what the meer Light or Law of Nature could do?—But it may be, you intended this in Connection with what follows, "and by which, all the World are become guilty before God." In Reply to which I would say, that from the 9th v. to the 20th *inclusively* of the 3d Chap. of *Rom.* the Apostle is shewing that the *Jews*, notwithstanding their many singular Advantages, were very corrupt and wicked, as well as the rest of Mankind. At the 9th Verse he asks the Question, *What then, are we better than they?* Are we *Jews*, upon the whole, better than were the *Gentiles*? And answers, *No, in no wise*; for we have before proved both *Jews* and *Gentiles* that they are all under Sin. The *Jews* had sinned under the Law: The *Gentiles* had sinned without the Law. The *Jews* had transgressed the Law of *Moses*; the *Gentiles*, the Law of Nature or moral Law. And then he alledges diverse Passages out of the *Old Testament*, speaking of the great and universal Corruption of Mankind, from the 10th to the 18th v. *inclusively*; and lest the *Jews* should apply it all to the *Gentiles*, the Apostle immediately adds, v. 19. *Now we know that what Things soever the Law saith, it saith to them that are under the Law.* As much as if he had said, These Things are written in your own Law, and are a Part of the Revelation which God has given to you *Jews* for your special Use: You can't therefore reasonably think your selves exempted out of this Account of the Corruption and Wickedness of Mankind. No, *Jews* as well as *Gentiles* are intended, That every Mouth may be stopped, and all the World become guilty before God. That is, that the Mouth of you *Jews* may be stopped as well as the Mouth of the *Gentiles*; and so all the Word hold themselves obnoxious to the righteous Judgment of God. Whereupon the Apostle proceeds, v. 20. *Therefore by the Deeds of the Law there shall*

no Flesh be justified in his Sight. That is, by the Deeds of the Jewish Law there shall no Flesh be justified in the Sight of God, any more than by the Deeds of the moral Law or Law of Nature. Those to whom he was speaking conceded the One; and the Apostle asserts the Other; viz, That even the Jewish Law, i. e. in Contradistinction to the Gospel, which was preached to Abraham and the Israelites, and was obscurely contained in the Types and Shadows of the whole Mosaic Dispensation; I say, even the Jewish Law in this Sense, the Apostle affirms) could not assure Men of the divine Favour and Acceptance by any Conformity they were capable of yielding to it: *For by the Law, says he, is the Knowledge of Sin.* That is, it stopped there; it discovered the miserable, undone Condition of sinful Men, but did not shew them their Remedy, or what Foundation God had laid through Christ for the Acceptance of their Repentance unto Pardon. And then the Apostle proceeds in the following Verses to shew how this Matter is cleared up in the Gospel; that therein Jesus Christ is set forth as a Propitiation for Sin thro' Faith in his Blood, to declare the Righteousness, or Mercy of God in the Remission of Sins that are truly repented of and forsaken; and therefore that tho' all have sinned and come short of the Glory of God, Jews as well as Gentiles; yet on Men's believing in Christ, embracing and professing his Gospel, and being brought thereby to true Repentance and Amendment of their Lives, they are justified freely by the Grace of God thro' the Redemption that there is in Jesus Christ.

Thus it is by the Jewish Law (and not by the moral) that the Apostle proves *all the World was become guilty before God.* He was speaking to the Jews, who readily enough conceded that the Gentiles were Sinners, and that there was no Hope for them. And it is by the Deeds of the Jewish Law (not the moral) that he directly and expressly affirms, *there could no Flesh be justified.* And so this Argument concludes Nothing for you, any more than the former.

It is true indeed, the Apostle grants (and so do I in my Sermon, and in all that I have ever said upon this Subject in my Life) that the Law of Nature or moral Law, had no Preference to the Jewish Law in these Respects. Men sinned under the Law of Nature as well as under the Law of Moses: And the Law of Nature in some Measure discovered the miserable and undone Condition they were in thereby; but it did not, any more than the Law of Moses point them out to an

an adequate Remedy. It could not give them Assurance that God would pardon the Sins of true Penitents, or accept of any Obedience short of that which was perfect. This is the alone Excellency and Glory of the Gospel, that God has let us know, *He is in Christ reconciling the World unto himself, not rigidly imputing their Trespases*; but inviting all Men to Repentance, and so to Mercy and Forgiveness.

Yet this is nothing to your Purpose; since though Men cannot be justified by any Deeds of Conformity to any Law whatever, yet it is of the Jewish Law and of Conformity to *That*, that the Apostle is speaking, when he says, that *by the Deeds of the Law, no Flesh can be justified*. The Jews (as I have said) granted this with Respect to the Gentiles and the Law of Nature; but were ready to think, that by such Conformity to their own Law as they were capable of yielding they might attain to Justification and Life, and so that there was no Need of their embracing the Gospel. The Apostle therefore endeavours to rectify this their Mistake; and in a most clear Way of Reasoning concludes, that no Sinner can be otherwise justified than by an Act of God's Grace in freely pardoning his Sins; and this through the Redemption wrought out by Jesus Christ; which if any would now hope on good and clear Grounds to be interested in, they must become *Christians*.

But you have another Argument still; let us try the Strength of that: You say, "It may be added, that it is the Law which was *not made void* by Faith, but rather established by it, Rom. 3. 31. Which cannot be understood of the ceremonial Law (for that is abolish'd, not establish'd by Faith) but of the moral, which is establish'd by Faith in more Senses than one." Without taking Notice of your calling the moral Part of the Jewish Law, the moral Law; and the other Part of it, the ceremonial Law, (which seems to be the Foundation of all your wrong and inconclusive Reasoning in this Part of your Performance: I say, without taking Notice of this) to your Argument last advanc'd I would reply, That the Apostle having shewn how Men could not be justified, viz. That the Jews could not be justified by any Acts of Conformity to the Jewish Law, any more than the Gentiles by Acts of Conformity to the Law of Nature; *all being Sinners*, and no Provision being made in that Case, *the Soul that did Ought presumptuously being to die*, and every One cursed who continued

not in all Things written in the Book of the Law to do them; and having shewn on the other Hand, how Men might be justified, viz, on their becoming sincere Christians by an Act of God's free Grace in pardoning their past Sins, and accepting their sincere, though not perfect Endeavours of Obedience, thro' the Redemption that there is in Jesus Christ: Jesus Christ having by his Obedience unto Death "render'd it consistent with the Honour and Laws of God, and the Ends of his Government, to forgive and accept such ill-deserving Creatures:" I say, the Apostle having largely discours'd these Things, and summed up his Argument, or brought it to a Conclusion in the 28th v. (the Text in Dispute) he next proceeds to shew, that this Method of Justification and Salvation by the Grace of God, through the Redemption that there is in Jesus Christ, lay equally open to the Gentiles, as it did to the Jews. He had intimated this before, at v. 22. But now, at the 29 ver. He asserts it more plainly. *Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes of the Gentiles also: Seeing it is one God that justifieth the Circumcision by Faith, and the Uncircumcision through Faith.* As much as if he had said, God is no Respector of Persons; but will receive Jews and Gentiles upon the same Terms. Let Men become Christians, and devote themselves to love and serve God, and they shall be accepted of him through Christ, whether they are circumcised or uncircumcised; for this makes no Difference. Whereupon an Objection arises: What, do Circumcision and all the Rites and Ceremonies of the Jewish Law signify just nothing at all; the uncircumcised Gentiles standing equally fair for Justification and Salvation upon the Terms of the Gospel, as the Jews? Do you not hereby render the whole Jewish Law a Thing entirely useless and insignificant? No; says the Apostle, *We do not thus make void the Law through Faith, but we establish the Law;* viz. as hereby it appears to have attained its End: The Law was your Schoolmaster to guide you to Christ; and so having accomplished the End, it was designed for, it is not made void, there is no Dishonour cast upon it; though it now expires of Course, as a Law made only for a Time of War expires without a formal Repeal, when a Time of Peace comes on; or, as a Law made only for such a People, when that People are destroyed, or are incorporated into another, continues no longer an Instrument of Government.

In this Sense the whole Jewish Law (I suppose) is disannulled, to make Way for Christianity; for there is verily a Dis-

annulling

annulling of the Commandment going before, for the Weakness and Unprofitableness thereof; as the Apostle speaks, Heb. 7. 18. For the Law made nothing perfect, as the bringing in of a better Hope, viz, Christianity, has done. Yet no Man of Sense will from hence infer, that the moral Law or any Part of it, is *disannulled*: The moral Law being as unchangeable as the Nature of Things; so that while Things continue as they are, and bear such Relations to one another as they do; moral Duties must result from thence, and cannot but be obliging. The political and ceremonial Parts of the Jewish Law are expired (not made void, but so far *established* that they appear to have answered the whole End they were designed for,) and the moral Part, though it obliges not Christians as a Part of the Jewish Law, yet as the moral Law, it obliges them in common with the rest of Mankind; and as it is become a Part of the Law of Christ, it obliges them now peculiarly; as it did the Jews formerly, as it was a Part of the Law of Moses.

The moral Law considered in its self, is unalterably and eternally the same: And it has always been supposed as a Rule of Life, in every Revelation that God has made to Men. So it was in the Revelation he made to Adam: So it was in the Revelation he made to the Jews: And so it is in the Revelation he has now last of all made to Christians. Yet, in my Opinion, it is highly improper to call the Part which the moral Law has born in either of these Dispensations, or positive Revelations of the Mind and Will of God to Men, the moral Law; the moral Law being distinctly considerable by its self apart from each of them; and many Things being true of it in that Respect, which are not true of it, either as given to Adam, to the Jews, or to Christians. It has been the same in each of these Dispensations. And therefore as the Jewish Law in particular, stood of a moral, as well as ceremonial Part; sometimes one, and sometimes the other of these, may be more peculiarly aim'd at, though the whole Law is spoken of: And consequently, if the moral Part of the Jewish Law should be more especially refer'd to by the Apostle, as what was not made void, but established by Faith, (which, I know is the Opinion of many learned and judicious Expositors; and it must be granted that the moral Part of the Jewish Law is otherwise established by Christianity than the ceremonial or ritual Part of the same Law, is,) yet this makes nothing for your Argument, or against mine: Inasmuch as for the same Reason, the ceremonial Part of the Jewish Law may be as particularly

particularly and specially refer'd to in the *Place*, which is in Controversy between us.

And that it is so, the very Manner of the Expression obliges me to believe. For if, when the Apostle says, *That by the Deeds of the Law there shall no Flesh be justified*, it might be understood of the moral Law, (as undoubtedly it might, if the *Context* would admit of it) because to a Man's being justified by personal Obedience to any Law, *considered as such*, his Obedience must be *perfect* and *unsinning*; yet when he says, that *a Man is justified by Faith without the Deeds of the Law*, it could not be so understood; for that would imply, that a Man might be justified by Faith without any Obedience at all: Which, besides that it would be a Contradiction in *Terms* (Faith itself, that which is acceptable to God, being an Instance of Obedience) would imply moreover a *Weakness* in the Apostle's Reasoning. For it will not follow, because no Man can be justified by personal Obedience, that therefore a Man may be justified *without* personal Obedience. The Reason why no Man can be justified by personal Obedience (without an Act of Grace in forgiving his Sin) is because no Man's personal Obedience is *perfect* and *unsinning*. But there is the widest Difference between this, and a Man's being exempted from yielding any personal Obedience at all; or his being accepted of God without a *sincere Obedience to the Gospel*. So that on Supposition, the moral Law, or rather the moral Part of the Jewish Law, was more especially refer'd to *here* and *there* in other Parts of the Epistle, yet it would not follow, that it was so likewise in the Text in Dispute; the very Manner of the Expression there being such, as obliges us to believe the contrary; and that they are the Rites and Ceremonies of the Jewish Law, or at most, the *Works of Judaism*, which are there set aside to make Way for the *Works of Christianity*.

I have stood the longer upon this, because I would have it taken Notice of, that I believe, as much as you, that no Man that is a Sinner, can be justified by his personal Obedience without an Act of Grace in the Forgiveness of his Sins. --- But though I believe that no Man can be justified by his personal Obedience; because every Man's personal Obedience is imperfect: Yet I believe, at the same Time, that no Man can be justified without personal Obedience, i. e. without *sincere Obedience to the Gospel*; which, I suppose, in the Apostle's Expression is included in the Term *Faith*; and consequently, that it is not excluded, in the Terms next following, *the Deeds of the Law*. But

But to proceed,

“ Let us now (say you) consider how Mr. *Balch* supports his explaining of Rom. 3. 28. as speaking of the Jewish Rites and Ceremonies under this Phrase, *Deeds of the Law*. And here we find his principal Arguments are two. *First*, he argues from the Occasion and Design of the Apostle's Epistle to the *Romans*; and *Secondly*, from the otherwise irreconcilable Contradiction there would be between the two Apostles *Paul* and *James*.”

“ *First*, (say you) Mr. *Balch* insists, that the Occasion and Design of the Apostle *Paul*'s Epistle to the *Romans* well attended to, will make it evident, that by *Deeds of the Law*, he must mean the Deeds of the *Ceremonial* or *Jewish Law*.”

“ The Occasion of his writing this Epistle (as you cite my Words) was a Controversy which in that Day subsisted in the Church, about the Necessity of Circumcision, and other Jewish Rites and Ceremonies. There were those who blended Christianity and Judaism together; making an impure Mixture of the Law and Gospel.---Now it was in Opposition to this prevailing Mistake, that the Apostle *Paul* wrote most of his Epistles.---- Particularly in confronting this Error, he asserts the Necessity of Faith, and the Sufficiency of *that alone* in order to Salvation.” “ Mr. *Balch*'s Argumentation (say you) is plainly this; the Apostle's chief Design in his Epistle to the *Romans* being manifestly to exclude the Rites of the ceremonial Law” (it should have been, *the Rites and Ceremonies of the Jewish Law*) “ from a Place in Christian Divinity, upon a Controversy respecting them, which had arisen in the Christian Church; it is therefore most likely, that these Jewish Rites and Ceremonies, and none other, are the Things which under the Stile, *Deeds of the Law*, he would exclude from any Part in our Justification.” All this I let stand.

“ But what if Mr. *Balch* is mistaken (say you) in what he takes to be the Occasion and Design of the Apostle *Paul* in writing most of his Epistles?” I think if I was mistaken in this, you would have done well to have shewn it, if you were able; that so I might have rectified my Mistake, it being in a Matter of great Moment. “ We verily believe (say you) he is mistaken respecting this Epistle with which himself and we are now principally concerned, *viz*, that to the *Romans*. For greater Justice (in our as well as many other Men's Apprehensions) would be done the Apostle, if we should

“ should say, that his great *Design* in this Epistle was to obviate such Doctrine as Mr. Balch has delivered to the World in the Sermon now under Consideration.” That is, the Apostle was more afraid, that those he wrote to would, without his solemn Caution, make an impure Mixture of Christian Faith and Christian Obedience, than of the Jewish Law and Christian Religion. He thought there was less Danger from the teaching of those who said, *Except ye be circumcised after the Manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved*, than from the Teaching of others, who, like Mr. Balch, held, that if Men would be saved, they must obey the Truth as well as believe it ; this latter Error being much more pernicious than the former.

“ And if there be Need (say you) to tell what was the Occasion, let it be this : The Leaven of the Scribes and Pharisees which consisted partly in their Doctrine of Justification by Works, had already begun to work among the Gentiles as well as Jews.” Indeed, Gentlemen, this is not said with a good Grace. I had mention'd a well known Fact, a Controversy of the greatest Importance, and of the greatest Extent, in the Apostle's Days : A Controversy on which both Sides laid much Stress : *Except ye be circumcised after the Manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved*, said they on the one Hand, Acts 15. begin. And on the other, *Behold I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing*, Gal. 5. 2. I had mention'd this as the Occasion of the Apostle's writing his Epistle to the Romans, and some others. No ; (say you) it is much more likely it was to obviate such Doctrine as Mr. Balch's ; and the Occasion might be that the Pharisees taught the same. The Pharisees taught that we must be sincere, good Men ; as well as have a Form of Knowledge, and make Profession of the Truth : That we must aim at pleasing God, and at the approving of our selves in his Sight, seeking the Honour which cometh from God only in obeying all his Commands. At this the Apostle was much offended ; and wrote his Epistle to the Romans to obviate such pernicious Doctrines, and to let them know, that they were intirely wrong ; that they hereby made an impure Mixture of Christian Faith and Christian Obedience ; whereas they ought to hold, that Faith alone justifies us in the Sight of God, and that good Works are only necessary to justify us in the Sight of Men. --- I am surpriz'd you should not foresee, this would be the Reply. I leave it to the World to judge, whose Doctrine, your's or mine, comes the nearest to that of the Pharisees, according to all that we

we read of them in *Scripture*. Was it the Error of the *Pharisees* that they thought they ought to aim at pleasing God in obeying his Commands? Or did they not think it enough if in what we do, we approve our selves to Men? Upon which of these Opinions was their Practice built? You say, they held the Doctrine of *Justification by Works*. It was then undoubtedly of a *Justification in the Sight of Men*: For to this their Practice was exactly conformable; they *did all their Works to be seen of Men*, Mat. 23. 5. And if this Doctrine of *yours*, (I may well call it your's, since you are so angry with me for opposing it; I say, if this Doctrine of *your's*, that it is the Office of good Works *only* to justify us in the Sight of *Men*) be true, *they* were exactly right. Which is so evident, that I should impose upon my Readers should I use more Words about it.

You proceed, "And respecting the Church of *Rome* in particular, the Apostle foresaw by the Prophetick Spirit, that "in a short Time it would prevail to *leaven the whole Lump*; "as indeed it did, becoming no small Part of her odious Apostacy, for which Christ hath *no Pleasure* in her." This is as little to your Purpose, as what you last advanced was wide from the Truth. For you know, *Gentlemen*, and every Body knows who has read my Sermon, that I cast the utmost Contempt upon the good Works of the Church of *Rome*, and explode her Doctrine of *Merit* as much as any Body has done. If She teaches one Sort of good Works, and I another; and if She teaches the *Merit* of good Works, and I only their *Necessity*; am I to be represented as holding the same Doctrine with the Church of *Rome*?---Indeed I can't help looking upon this as a very *mean Artifice* to blacken the Doctrine of my Sermon with your less knowing Readers; when you your selves could not but know, there was no Similitude in the Case: And I think you ought to bear my treating this Matter with some Warmth of Indignation. If I should tell you, your whole Scheme was hatched in the darkest Times of *Popery* by lazy, ignorant *Monks*, who had nothing to do but to perplex the Doctrines of the *Gospel* with endless *Querks* and *Niceties*, that so they might bring the People by Degrees, understanding none of them, to have an implicit Faith in themselves; it would not be half so wide of the Truth, as what you have here intimated of the Doctrine of my Sermon.---
Teach me, and I will hold my Tongue: Cause me to understand wherein I have erred.---How forcible are right Words! But what
 F doth

doth your Arguing reprove ? For even on Supposition that the Church of *Rome* holds the same that I do, if it be the Truth, is it to be rejected on that Account ? The Church of *Rome* holds, there is *one God* ; and the *Pharisees* held it too ; and the very *Devils* believe it. Now if when you teach the same, it should be reflected on, upon those Accounts ; would you think it decent ? Or would you take it well, that your Doctrine in any other Instance, should be exposed to the Rage of the unthinking Multitude, in such a deceitful Way of Reasoning ?

Yet you go on to strengthen what you have said, by adding,
 “ To justify which Opinion of ours concerning the Occasion
 “ and Design of the Apostle in this Epistle, Mr. *Balch* knows,
 “ that many learned and judicious Interpreter’s Judgment
 “ might be produced.”

I shall pass this without Reply, as being of no Manner of Importance, and hasten to profess my entire Agreement with you in what next follows, “ But we chuse to let the Apostle speak for himself.” I think, ’tis Pity you have not done so all along.

“ So far is it (say you) from Truth, which he observes (i. e. “ which Mr. *Balch* observes, P. 16.) that his Opinion is justified from many Passages in the Epistle ; that we think, there “ are many Passages in it which plainly contradict him.” ---- Your Opposition here, *Gentlemen*, does not seem to be clear. What if there should be many Passages in the Epistle to the *Romans*, that plainly speak of the Law of Nature, or moral Law ; will it from thence follow, that there are not many Passages too in the same Epistle which speak no less plainly of the Jewish Law ? Or that it can’t be of this latter, that the Apostle speaks in the controverted Text : I think by no Means.* Tho’ you go on and say, “ For if those Passages taken

* That there are many Passages in the Epistle to the *Romans*, which plainly speak of the Jewish Law, and can be interpreted of no other ; enough to justify my Observation in P. 16. of my Sermon, I would here briefly shew. Thus ver. 12. of the 2d Chap. (and which indeed is the first Time that the Word *Law* occurs in the Epistle : For though you often speak of the Use of the Word in the three first Chapters, it is not used in the first Chapter at all, nor in the second till now) *For as many as have sinned without Law.*—Will you interpret this of the moral Law ? *For as many as have sinned*, who were not under the Obligation of the moral Law, nor were favoured with so much as the Light of Nature ;—when and where did these People live ? And to omit the Use of the Word in what

“ taken Notice of in the *three* first Chapters by Mr. Profef-
 “ *for*, do prove, that it is the Law of Nature, or moral Law,
 “ of which the Apostle speaks in *several* Places, then it can-
 “ not consistently with Truth be said, that the Matter of this
 “ Epistle argues his Design to be, only an Exclusion of the
 “ Rites and Ceremonies of the *Jewish* Law.” Answer, why
 not ? Since in those Passages which speak of the Law of
 Nature, or moral Law, nothing is excluded ; but only in those
other Passages, which speak of the Jewish Law.

“ Or that the Occasion of his writing was to confront the
 “ Mistake of those, who would mingle *Judaism* with *Christi-*
 “ *anity*, at least principally ; but rather the Error of those,
 “ who would make as impure a Mixture of Man’s *Obedience*
 “ with his Faith in applying the Righteousness of Christ for
 “ Justification.” This admits of the same Answer with the
 former ; the *Consequence* is not clear.----And if you have *fail-*
ed too as to Proof, that those Passages in the three first Chap-
 ters *do* speak of the Law of Nature or moral Law (as I think
 I have shewn, with Respect to all of them but *one*, and that
that was not to your Purpose) the Matter is so much worse
 still.

As to the Design of the Apostle “ to confront the Error
 “ of those who would make an impure Mixture of Man’s O-
 “ bedience with his Faith in applying the Righteousness of
 “ Christ for Justification,” I can’t tell very well what you
 mean by it, but am ready to think from diverse other Passages
here and there scattered thro’ your *Remarks*, that you may hold
 thus ; viz. that tho’ all other saving Graces must be along with
 Faith, in order to our being interested in the Merits and
 Righteousness of Christ ; yet it is an Act of *Faith*, and not of
 any other Grace to *receive* and *rely* upon his meritorious Right-
 eousness and Obedience. This I have no where contradict-

what follows in this Chapter, and in the next, because I have generally
 consider’d those Places already ; let us pass over to the *fourth* and *fifth*
 Chapters, and so on. The first Time the Word occurs in the *fourth*
 is in ver. 13. *For the Promise that he should be the Heir of the World, was*
not to Abraham or to his Seed, THRO’ THE LAW.—Is it possible, that the
 Law here refer’d to, should be the Law of Nature ? Is it not evidently
 the Jewish written Law ? And so all along ; *if they which are of the*
LAW—The LAW worketh Wrath—Until the LAW Sin was in the World—
The LAW entered that the Offence might abound, and the like, in too many
 Places to be particularly cited. I suppose, that for *five* Times that the
 Word is used for the *moral* Law, it may be used *fifty* for the *Jewish* at
 least, throughout the Writings of the *New-Testament*.

ed. I believe, that to receive and rely upon the meritorious Righteousness and Obedience of Christ, is an Act of Faith, in a proper Sense of the Word as it is used in Scripture. But then I believe too, that it is an Act of *such* Faith as God has commanded ; and consequently that it is an Act of Obedience at the same Time. And therefore, why I may not call it the *Obedience* of Faith, with as good Right, and as much Propriety, as you call it *Faith*, I see not : Nor why, if I do, it should be counted making an impure Mixture of Man's Obedience with his Faith in applying the Righteousness of Christ.

I suppose you allow, that to *rely* upon the meritorious Righteousness of Christ, is an Act of Obedience, i. e. is what God requires of all those to whom the Gospel is fairly and sufficiently proposed ; as I allow that it is an Act of Faith in a very proper Sense of the Word. And if so ; then I can't conceive why you should be offended at my calling it *Obedience*, any more than that I have a Right to be offended with your calling it *Faith*. And especially since when the Apostle says, *And being made perfect, he became the Author of eternal Salvation to all them that OBEY him*, he makes Obedience as much the Condition of Man's Salvation by Christ, as Faith is made the Condition of it in any other Text in the *Bible*.--- But though I believe that to rely upon the meritorious Righteousness of Christ for Justification and Salvation, is an Act of Faith ; and assert moreover, that it is an Act of Obedience to the Will of God, where Men have any sufficient Evidence that this is his Will, yet I do in no wise believe, that this Act of Faith or this Act of Obedience, (be it called which it will) is *all* that is necessary on our Part in order to our being entitled to, and interested in Christ's justifying and saving Merits. And if you differ with me here, I should have been glad to have known it, that I might have more abundantly labour'd your Conviction. I freely confess, this is one Thing I endeavoured to guard People against in my Sermon. I supposed then, and do still, that there are many wicked Men in the World, who *rely* upon the Righteousness of Christ for Justification and Salvation, even without any Righteousness of their own, so *firmly* that they have little or no Doubt in their Minds about it, *but that they shall be saved by him* ; who yet will be finally disappointed, because they were not *qualified*, in other Respects, to rest and *rely* upon him therefor. I imagine, this is the very Error of *Antinomianism* ; and that it is what our Saviour intended particularly to warn People against in that very solemn, but too little

little thought of Text, Mat. 7. 21. *Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven ; but he that doth the Will of my Father which is in Heaven.*

And therefore, if this is what you mean by representing the Occasion of the Apostle's Epistle to the *Romans*, not to be, " to confront the *Mistake* of those who would mingle "*Judaism and Christianity* (a very small, trifling *Mistake* !) " but rather the Error of others who made as impure a Mixture of Man's *Obedience* with his *Faith* in applying the Righteousness of Christ for *Justification* ;" i. e. if you intend by applying the Righteousness of Christ for Justification the same Thing with our becoming entitled to, and *interested* in his justifying Merits and Righteousness ; then I say, this is so far from being an Error, that the Apostle I am sure, would never write an Epistle to confront it. For he himself was in this Error as much as any other *inspired* Writer whatever : Often making this *Mixture of Man's Obedience with his Faith*, or in fewer Words, *the Obedience of Faith*, the great Condition of an Interest in Christ. Thus in several Texts before cited, 1 Cor. 7. 19. *Circumcision is Nothing and Uncircumcision is Nothing, but keeping the Commandments of God.* And Heb. 5. 9. *Being made perfect, he became the Author of eternal Salvation to all them that obey him.* And in this very Epistle, Rom. 2. 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 *Verses*, which the Reader may see at Leisure. Let us now proceed,

" If the Apostle (say you, advancing a new Argument in the same 16th Page, if the Apostle) herein affirms that *Abraham* was justified, not by *Works*, but by *Faith*, and that even in *Uncircumcision*, it is a Proof, that the Apostle's Design (in Part at least) in this Epistle, was to assert Justification by Faith in Opposition to *moral Works* : Since *Abraham's* Justification by Faith while in *Uncircumcision*, was of a prior Date to the ceremonial Law."

If Men produce an Argument, that only makes Nothing for them, it is thought a Defect in Reasoning ; but if they produce one that proves just the contrary to what they intended, and an *Adversary* should upon such an Occasion triumph a little, it would be no Proof of an undue Disposition in him that Way. This Argument, *Gentlemen*, is as evidently *against* you, as the former were evidently *not for* you.

The Apostle represents *Abraham* as justified not by Works, but by *Faith* ; and that not in *Circumcision* but in *Uncircumcision*.

The

The plain Consequence from which is, that he could not be justified by the Works of the *Jewish Law*, for his Justification was of a Date *prior* to his Observation of *that Law*; he was not so much as *circumcised*.

This you bring as a Proof, that he was not justified by *moral Works*; and give the very same Reason for it, that is given why he could not be justified by the *Jewish Law*, "Since" (say you) his Justification in Uncircumcision was of a *prior* "Date to the ceremonial Law." But I beseech you, was his Justification of a *prior* Date to the *moral Law*? If it was; it would be Proof, that he could not be justified by *moral Works*. But as this is infinitely absurd; and as it is only asserted, that it was of a *prior* Date to the *Jewish Law*, it can only prove, that he was not justified by *Jewish Works*. Which is the very Thing that I plead the Apostle was contending for.*

You go on to another Argument; "So also (say you) if "Stealing, and Adultery, and Idolatry, be Violations of the "moral Law," (and were not Violations of the *Jewish Law*, you should have added) "then it is plain and evident, that it "is the moral Law which the Apostle hath before his Eyes in "the 2d Chapter of this Epistle, and whereof he would shame "Men out of their vain Boasting."

"And to omit (say you) a Multitude of other Passages to "our present Purpose; the Apostle tells the *Roman Believers*, "Chap. 7. ver. 4. *Ye are also become dead to the Law by the Body "of Christ*. By which it is evident that he means the *moral*, "eternal Law;" (to be sure, what other Law can Men become dead to, but an *eternal Law*? i. e. a Law that they can

* See Rom. 4. 9, 10, 11, and 12 Verses. Particularly in the 12th ver. You will find what Sort of *Faith* that was, by which *Abraham* was justified in Uncircumcision.—*The Father of the Circumcision to them who are not of the Circumcision only, but also walk in the Steps of that Faith of our Father Abraham, which he had, being yet uncircumcised. To walk in the Steps of that Faith of our Father Abraham, which he had, being yet uncircumcised, if I mistake not, is, from a Principle of Faith to obey the Commands of God, as Abraham did. And in the Verse following, For the Promise that he should be the Heir of the World, was not to Abraham or to his Seed thro' the Law, i. e. evidently through the Jewish Law, but thro' the Righteousness of Faith. See for Proof of this, Gal. 3. 16, 17. Now to Abraham and his Seed were the Promises made—and this I say, that the Covenant which was confirmed before of God, in Christ, the Law which was 430 Years after cannot disannul.—What Law could that be, which was 430 Years after the Covenant God made with Abraham, but the Mosaic or Jewish Law?* never

never become dead to, because it lives for ever, and is of immutable, eternal Obligation ?) "The same Law (say you) whose Rectitude discovers the Obliquity of Men's Lusts and evil Works : For it follows in the 7th Verse, *Now, I had not known Sin, but by the Law : For I had not known Lust, except the Law had said, Thou shalt not covet.*" And was there no such Precept in the Jewish Law, as, *Thou shalt not covet* ?--- And might not that Law help to discover the Obliquity of Men's Lusts and evil Works, even above what the meer Light and Law of Nature was fitted to do?---To what Purpose then are these your Reasonings ?

Thus I have considered all that you have advanced against my *first* Argument, taken from the *Occasion* and *Design* of the Apostle in writing his Epistle to the *Romans*. I think it is very evident, notwithstanding all that you have been able to say, that by Deeds of the Law in the controverted *Text*, the Apostle ought to be understood to mean the *Deeds* of the *Mosaic* or *Jewish* Law, as what have no Concern in our Justification. I have shewn, that he is speaking of *this* Law before that *Text* and after it, almost every where else in the Epistle ; and that there is *peculiar* Reason for his being understood as speaking of the *Jewish* Law in that *Text*, even above what there is, for his being so understood elsewhere. So that tho' you make *grievous* Complaint " of my forcibly shutting the Mouth of that *Text*, which you esteem your Oracle," I imagine the Reader will think you have done very little hitherto to open it : And now perhaps my *second* Argument may shut its Mouth forever, i. e. from saying *any more* what you would have it say, in Favour of a Justification by *Faith* without *moral* Righteousness and Obedience.

You rightly observe, that my *second* and principal *Argument*, whereby I would prove that the Apostle *Paul's* Deeds of the Law which he excludes from any Part in our Justification, mean the Deeds of the *Jewish*, and not of the *moral* Law, is, " Because there would be otherwise an irreconcilable Contradiction between the two Apostles, *St. Paul* and *St. James*." I said this upon Supposition, that the Apostle *James* treats of the *same* great and important Justification that the Apostle *Paul* treats of. And having considered all that you have advanced against this Interpretation of the Apostle *James*, and offered such further Objections against your Interpretation of him, as I think will not be easily removed ; and upon the whole proved

(as I imagine) to the Satisfaction of every intelligent Person, whose Mind is not fast shut with Prejudice; that he must be understood as speaking of the same great and important *Justification* that the Apostle *Paul* is speaking of under that *Term*, and that he cannot be understood *otherwise* with any Honour to his *Epistle*, or indeed *Justice* to the sacred *Canon*; I say, having already done thus much, my Argument above stands in full Force, *viz*, that if we understand the Apostle *Paul* by Deeds of the *Law*, to mean Deeds of the *moral Law*, which are the same that the Apostle *James* intends by *Works*, they can never be reconciled; but would contradict one another in the fullest and most direct Manner, that any two Writers can possibly do.

It is true, the Rev. *Professor*, in what you have cited from him, has reconciled the two Apostles in another Way; but it is upon the Supposition, that they treat not only of a *diverse Faith* (which is granted,) but also of a *diverse Justification*: which, I think, I have proved they do not.

And upon the Supposition that they do not treat of a *diverse*, but of the same *Justification*, I have both his Concession and yours; that they cannot be reconciled at all, if the Apostle *Paul* should intend the same Thing by *Deeds of the Law*, that the Apostle *James* intends by *Works*. So that the whole Weight of this Argument from the *Irreconcilableness* of the two Apostles, if St. *Paul* should be understood to mean by *Deeds of the Law*, Deeds of the *moral*, and not of the *Jewish Law*, rests upon the Evidence I have given, or that may be given, to this Truth, That they do not treat of a *diverse*, but *in Substance* of the same *Justification*: And upon this (*viz*, as much Evidence as we have that the two Apostles treat of the same *Justification*, so much Evidence have we, that the Apostle *Paul* by Deeds of the *Law*, intends *Deeds of the Jewish*, and not of the *moral Law*; upon this I say) I am willing to leave it.

Only before I pass on to the next Thing you complain of, I would just say, that it is surprizing to me, any should be fond by interpreting the Apostle *Paul* of *moral*, and not of *Jewish Works*, to make him speak, to the nearest Appearance, disparagingly of that which he elsewhere speaks of as the very *End* of the evangelical Dispensation, and as the great *Design* of the Redemption of fallen Man by Jesus Christ. Why must he be made *but to seem to thwart* the great Design of all Religion, to *contradict* another Apostle in express Words, and
himself

himself in far the greatest Part of what he has written? Are the *Distinctions*, made Use of upon this Occasion, *intelligible* enough, to obviate the ill Effects of such an Interpretation, with Respect to the Body of the People? Indeed, *Gentlemen*, I fear they are not. I find the worthy *Professor* saying, that it is not the *Faith*, but the *Justification*, which is *without the Deeds of the Law*. And I find you saying, "That though it "never be found" (i. e. tho' this *Faith* of the Apostle *Paul*, is never found) "without the Deeds of the Law, seeing it is a "perpetual, internal Principle of all good Works; yet these "good Works, which flow from it, participate not with it in "its justifying Influences," P. 17. These Things are dark: They are very dark, I am sure, to me; and I think, I may reasonably suppose, they are so to others, Christians in general will never be the wiser for such *nice* Distinctions. Perhaps, as you wrote chiefly to set the common People right in this Controversy, you might think, that when they had perused your *Remarks*, they would readily apprehend wherein you and Mr. *Balch* differed. If they can do it, I am sure, it is more than I can do, after a careful Perusal of your *Remarks* many Times over: For I must after all profess, that I am utterly unable, with any Certainty, to apprehend your *Meaning* in this, and a Number of other like Passages; on which, I am notwithstanding perswaded, you lay some Stress, and possibly may suppose the *Main* of the Controversy turns.

Sometimes I think you may mean by *Faith*, in this Passage, the *Righteousness* or the *Redemption* of Christ, apprehended by Faith, as being *that* that justifies us otherwise than any of our own Graces or good Works do: And if I were sure that this was your Meaning, I should agree with you in the *Thing*, tho' not in the *Expression* of it.

Sometimes I am ready to think, you really imagine, that *resting* and *relying* upon the *Righteousness* of Christ for Salvation, (which in this Case you call *Faith*) is the sole necessary Condition of our being interested in his *Righteousness*, and entitled to eternal Salvation thereby, without Regard to Repentance, Obedience, Holiness, or any other of what are usually called *saving* Graces. But then I check myself; surely these *Gentlemen* cannot mean, that a bare resting and relying upon Christ for Salvation, is, without the Graces of a renewed Soul, and that *Repentance* which is from *dead Works* unto *New-Obedience*, the sole Condition of obtaining it. For then the wickedest of Men might go to Heaven; though they

G

would

would have no *Reward*, no *Crown of Righteousness*, after they were got there.

Then I am in Doubt whether you have not stumbled into that Error of the *Romanists*, which towards the Beginning of your *Remarks* you charge me with, viz, of not distinguishing between *Justification* and *Sanctification*. The “justifying Influences” of Faith, is what blunders me. Its *sanctifying Influences* I could understand well enough, even in Contradistinction to good Works. But what Influence *Faith* has on our *Justification*, different from the Influence of all other saving Graces, I cannot tell. I know, we can be saved no more without the Love of God, without Meekness, Mercifulness, a Readiness to forgive Injuries that are done us, and the like, than we can without Faith in Christ.

Faith, I acknowledge, is the *Mother-Grace*, and the Root and Principle of the others : And so I can understand its *sanctifying* Influences. But for its *justifying* Influences, I must needs say, I am utterly at a Loss ; i. e. to understand what justifying Influence *Faith* has, different from the justifying Influence of every other saving Grace, when those other Graces are all as necessary to our being justified, as Faith it self.

To what Purpose is it, *Gentlemen*, thus to speak, “ All other “ saving Graces and good Works must accompany *Faith*, *Faith* “ is good for nothing *without them*, it is not Faith : And yet “ when they are all added to Faith, they do no Manner of “ Good ; it is after all Faith *alone* that justifies and saves us ? ” It is saying and unsaying : And can serve no other End, but to puzzle and perplex People ; and while it takes them off from making any good Use of their own *Understanding*, to bring them to throw themselves upon other Men’s. And as with a View to this, such Kind of Distinctions were at first invented ; so they are now kept up only to support and maintain an ungrounded Interpretation of the Apostle *Paul*, as if he was speaking of *moral* and *christian* good Works ; when he is really speaking of no other, than of the *Works of the Jewish Law*. To have prevented which Mistake no more was necessary, than only to have attended to the Writings of the *New-Testament* themselves : Wherein abundant Care was taken to inform us of the *Law* there spoken of in general, that it was given by *MOSES*, that it was not from *ADAM* to *MOSES*, that it was *Four Hundred and Thirty Years* after *ABRAHAM* ; (fine Descriptions, to be sure, of the *moral Law* !) but even when speaking of the *Doctrine of Justification* in particular, the Apostle

posse has let us know, that it was the Law of *Moses* he referred to, as that by which Men could not be justified. Acts 13. 37. *By him (i. e. by Christ) all that believe are justified from all Things, from which they could not be justified by the Law of Moses.* If the Words (of *Moses*) had not been here inserted in the *sacred Text*, you would have been very sure (I am apt to think) that it was the *moral Law* that was intended : And indeed you might have insisted on it, with as much Reason, as you do with Respect to the *Text* we are upon.

So in the *Epistle to the Galatians*, it is evident beyond all Contradiction, that the Works which are *excluded* from having any Thing to do in the Justification of Men under the *Gospel*, are the Works of the *Jewish Law*. This might be made to appear from almost every Verse in the *Epistle*, where *Works* or *Justification* are spoken of. But I shall chuse to refer you to the *Epistle* it self ; recommending it to your careful and unprejudic'd Examination with *this* in View, and not doubting but you may *so* receive full Satisfaction.

And now give me Leave to say, (alluding to the Apostle's Words in another Case) *why it should be thought a Thing incredible with you*, that they should be the Deeds of the *Jewish Law*, and not of the *moral*, which are excluded in the Business of Justification ? Have the Deeds of the *Jewish* or *Mosaic Law*, any Thing to do in this Affair ? If not, then they may be excluded with Truth. But can this be said of the Deeds of the *moral Law* ? Have we no more to do with the *moral Law*, or with the Light and Law of Nature, now under the *Gospel*, in Order to our pleasing God and securing his Favour through Christ, than we have to do with the *Jewish Law*, considered as *such* ? This you dare not say, since the *moral Law*, as *such*, is as binding upon Christians, as ever it was upon any other Men in the World ; besides its peculiar binding Obligation upon them as a Part of the *Law of Christ*. And yet this would seem to be the Apostle's Meaning, if they were the Works of the *moral*, and not of the *Jewish Law*, which were excluded in the controverted Text. For the Apostle in this Case would say, *not*, ' That a Man can't be justified by any Deeds of Conformity to the *moral Law* : ' This is granted ; inasmuch as after all that a Man can do, his Deeds of Conformity to the Law will be *imperfect*, and far *short* of what it requires ; and therefore there is no attaining to Justification and Life in *that Way* : But he would say, ' That a Man may be

‘ be justified *without* any Deeds of Conformity to the moral Law ;’ which is certainly a very *different* Thing ; and is what I can in no wise grant, because it would be saying, ‘ That forasmuch as an *absolutely perfect* and *sinless* Obedience to the moral Law is not made, under the Gospel, the Condition of Justification and Life ; therefore, *no Obedience at all*, *no Conformity at all* to the *moral* Law, is now necessary ; but Men may be justified *without* any Endeavours or Dispositions that Way :’ Which would exclude even *Faith* itself ; the *Obligation* to which (upon Supposition of a positive Revelation of the divine Will) is founded in the moral Law ; and so it would be a Contradiction in Terms, a saying ‘ That a Man was justified by *Faith*, when even the *Obligation* to *that* was become null and void, and it might as well be let alone as complied with.’ Which is so absurd, that I would fain hope you will not charge it upon an inspired Writer : But will rather relinquish the Opinion.

And so I proceed to the next Thing you complain of, *viz*, Page 24. “ Of my not having given in my Sermon the true scriptural Account of *Faith* ; and that either as justifying “ or sanctifying.”

You seem, *Gentlemen*, to have forgot the Occasion and Design of my Sermon : Or else you were resolved to give your selves Scope enough, that if you could not convince your Readers of any Thing very bad in the Sermon ; you might at least perswade them, that something very good was wanting in it.---But was it the Business of my Sermon to give a *full, large, and particular* Account of *Faith*, and that either as justifying or sanctifying ? Did I propose any such Thing ? Or any more than briefly, in order to reconcile the two Apostles, to shew what was intended by PAUL’s *Faith without the Deeds of the Law*, and by JAMES’s *Faith and Works* together ? And did I not do this in such a Manner, that any Body might understand me ; and in such a Manner too, that you yourselves, though apt enough to complain and take Offence, yet have not ventured directly to find Fault with it. I think you nowhere say, that I have taken either of the Apostles wrong as to what they mean by *Faith* : Either that *James’s* Faith does not consist in meer *Assent* to revealed Truths, or that *Paul’s* Faith is not to be taken in a larger Sense, for *Faith with the Obedience of Faith*.

But you say (in P. 25.) I have “ in a great Measure divested

“ed Faith of its very Nature, Beauty, and Influence,” in giving this, and no other Account of it. *Answer*, Is not the Nature of Faith well enough exprest by *Assent* to revealed Truths ? And are not the *Beauty* and *Influence* of it implied and strongly held forth in those other Expressions of the *Fruits* and of the *Obedience* of Faith ? How then have I divested Faith by this Account, either of its Nature, or of its Beauty and Influence ? If the Nature of Faith does not consist in *Assent* to revealed Truths ; you should have told us what it does consist in : And if the Beauty and Influence of Faith do not lie in the *Fruits* of Righteousness, and in the *Obedience* of an holy and good Life, which spring from Faith ; you should have informed us better : Which I think you have not done.

But you go on to complain “ That though I sometimes “ speak of the *Consent* of the Will, yet this and some other “ Sentences of like Import, do plainly, by the Context, relate to Christ only as a King, and denote, that we must be “ govern’d by his *Precepts*,” referring to P. 9. of my Sermon. I answer, this is a great Mistake : I do in no wise by the *Consent* of the Will, or by the *Obedience* of Faith, mean to express only a Necessity of our being governed by Christ’s Precepts, considered as a King : But I include Obedience to all the Revelations and Discoveries God has made of his Mind and Will ; and in particular, to that Command of his, *that Men should believe on the Name of his Son Jesus Christ*, 1 Joh. 3. 23. This I suppose includes among other Things “ A “ Necessity of our hearty Acceptance of, and Dependance “ upon, the meritorious Righteousness of Christ for Justification.” Or whatever else is *any where* made our Duty in the Word of God, I certainly include it in that Expression of the *Obedience* of Faith, or in a *Consent* of the Will to be governed in a Conformity to revealed Truths. So that if you made this Mistake *unwillingly*, as I shall charitably allow ; yet I think no One will excuse you from having made it *carelessly*, who will be at the Pains of examining my own Words in the Page you refer to, and which for the Reader’s Ease I have placed in the Margin.*

* In Answer to the Question, What then are we to understand by *Faith* and *Works* in the Apostle *James*, which I say are the same with *Faith* in the Apostle *Paul*, I reply, ‘ Not only the Assent of the Mind to revealed Truths, but the Consent of the Will also to be govern’d in a Conformity to them. Or such a *Belief* of the Gospel, as draws Obedience along with it : Faith with the Obedience of Faith, &c.

You proceed in the next Place, after citing considerable from Dr. Manton, "relating (as you express it) to Man's Justification by *imputed* Righteousness, received and made ours by Faith, uniting us to him who is the Fountain of Righteousness," saying, "And now if any one can shew us this *Imputation* of Christ's Righteousness to us, this *Union* to Christ, whereby his Righteousness becomes imputed or accounted to us, or that *Faith* in Christ whereby such an Union can be made;—in Mr. Balch's Sermon, we will readily acknowledge that we have mistaken him." Indeed, *Gentlemen*, I think you ought to acknowledge something worse than a Mistake here; and that, whether any Body can shew you these Things in my Sermon or not. For was it the particular Subject, or Design of my Sermon to treat either of the *Imputation* of Christ's Righteousness to us, or of that *Union* to Christ whereby his Righteousness becomes ours, or of that *Faith* in Christ whereby such an Union is effected? If it was not; why is any Body called upon to shew you these Things in a Sermon which never professed to treat of either of them? Was there never a good Discourse form'd upon any Subject in Divinity which did not particularly and largely handle some one of these Points: Or even grasp them all? I can't help observing, that it looks as if you were *hard drove* for Matter of Complaint, when you are forced to betake your selves *every now and then* to such pitiful Shifts. What if I have not *haled* in these Points just as you might have done? Is my Sermon less perfect because I pursued the single Point in View; without stepping aside *ever and anon* to pull in by the Head and Shoulders some darling Notion that was foreign to the Subject?—And yet after all, I could easily shew, if it were needful, that these Things are in the Sermon you complain of, in that brief and general Way in which only it was fitting they should be there. But I chuse to pass on.

III Your next Complaint of my Sermon "That you can't find in it such a Faith as *sanctifies*, i. e. that is an internal Instrument of this in the Hand of the Holy Spirit; or a gracious Principle within a Man, whereby he denies Ungodliness," &c, is yet more unreasonable still: Because I have very largely and particularly all along insisted upon the *sanctifying Influences* of Faith? asserting their Necessity even more than is common upon such a Subject. And after fatiguing your selves awhile where to find this *sanctifying* Faith, you at Length

Length acknowledge, "That I had eased you of the Trouble
 " of much Inquiry in the Case, by declaring that it is *Assent*
 " to revealed Truths which I account the *Root and Principle* of
 " Gospel Obedience, and Christian Practice." For which
 you very readily cite, in P. 30, of my Sermon, this Passage,
 " These are both, my *Brethren*, essential Parts of Christianity,
 " *Faith and Practice*: Let us not under Pretence of exalting
 " the One, decry the Other. Without all Controversy *Faith*
 " is a most divine and heavenly Thing, and has the Preference
 " as it is the *Root and Principle* of the Other. And yet in re-
 " gard that *Practice* is the *End* to which it is designed, *Faith* is
 " very fitly said to be made perfect by *Works*, and is justly es-
 " teemed altogether uselefs and insignificant without them." .
 And then you remark upon it thus, " To any one who reads
 " this Paragraph, and compares it with many other Passages
 " in his Sermon, we think it is plain enough" (though it was
 wonderfully obscure just before) " that his Faith, as it here
 " stands in Opposition to *Practice*, is the same which he also
 " calls a *meer naked Assent to revealed Truths*, and elsewhere al-
 " lows that it may be possessed by very *bad Men*, and even
 " *Devils*." And what then? Is *Assent to revealed Truths* less
 necessary, or less excellent, because it may be found in bad
 Men, or even Devils? You seem to think so. For you go on,
 " Yet this *meer naked Assent*, this Faith of bad Men and
 " Devils, is (it seems) a most divine and heavenly Thing :
 " Which Clauses, how far they are consistent, we leave at
 " present." I heartily wish you had not left it, as you have;
 but had shewn, or attempted to shew, the Inconsistency of
 these Things: For it is not what at once appears. The Ar-
 gument is deceitful, and will take with none but the weakest
 of the People. Men of Sense know, that though the Devils
 believe *There is one God*; it is not a less *fundamental Article* of
 Faith upon that Account: But he that cometh to God, must still
 believe that he is---And there is no Room for the Exercise even
 of any Religion without it. The Devils also early believed,
 that *Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God*, (Mat. 8. 29.) and
 made Confession of it. But is this Article of *Christian Belief*, to
 be thought of, or spoken, of with less Honour for that? Is it
 less useful, less excellent? Is it not after all, a most divine and
 heavenly Article of Faith, and the most fundamental in the whole
Christian Revelation?

But it seems, " You are not well satisfied in my making this
 Faith,

“ *Faith*, which bad Men and Devils are capable of, the *Root* and *Principle* of Christian Practice.”

Now I thought all Men had frequently spoken after the same Manner ; distinguishing (as I did) Christianity into Christian Faith and Christian Practice ; and holding, that Christian Faith (though when thus spoken of in Distinction from Christian Practice, it may be in bad Men and Devils) is yet a necessary, essential Part of Christianity, and the Root and Principle of the rest. I make no Doubt but *you* sometimes speak thus yourselves. Or if you do not, I am very sure that the holy *Scriptures* do so speak and distinguish ; (which I should think, might have covered me from Blame upon this Account) *If ye know these Things, happy are ye if ye do them*, Joh. 13. 17. And not to multiply Texts in so plain a Case, I shall only mention further, Mark 16. 16. *He that believeth, and is baptized shall be saved*, i. e. he that believes the Gospel, and by Baptism enters into a solemn Profession and Obligation to obey it, which Profession and Obligation he is afterwards careful to verify and make good, the same shall be saved.

But you have two Arguments against this Position, that *Assent to revealed Truths is the Root and Principle of Christian Practice*. One is, “ That taking it for something within a Man “ inclining him to live and act as a Christian, it would follow “ that all who had this Assent to revealed Truths, would be “ wrought upon to become real Christians ; which is not true.” And the Other ; “ That supposing it to be something which “ needs the Assistance and Influence of the divine Spirit to “ render it effectual, it is very improperly called a Principle. Both which are built upon putting asunder what God hath joined together. And therefore, to the former, I need only say, Will it follow, because some Men hold the Truth in Unrighteousness, that therefore others are not, knowing the Truth, made free ? And to the latter, Will it follow, because Men need the Assistance and Influence of divine Grace in order to their rightly improving Christian Knowledge and Assent to revealed Truths, that therefore the Knowledge and Belief of the Truth, is not rightly spoken of as the Principle of Christian Practice, and is not the Instrument in the Hand of the Holy Spirit, of Men’s Sanctification ?

You seem to me here to chuse, by an odd, inconsistent Way of speaking, to keep yourselves as much in the Dark as possible. What Reason I have to say this I will leave to anyone to judge, who will be at the Pains of examining your own Expression

Expression of Things in the Beginning of your 27th Page, from whence these Arguments are taken. And yet if One can pick out the Meaning of what you say, and separate the inconsistent Terms you throw in, it is no hard Matter to answer it. "Effectually inclining him!" Who ever supposed that Assent to revealed Truths, *effectually*, i. e. (in the Sense you use it) irresistably and never-faillingly inclines Men to live and act as Christians: And that without the Assistance and Influence of the divine Spirit? So, "until another supernatural Principle of greater Efficacy, be infused from above, &c." Do Men use to speak of the Assistance and Influence of the divine Spirit, after this Manner? as *another Principle* not co-operating with the *Belief* of the Truth; but making *that* improperly to be called a Principle? May not *Belief* of the Truth be the Principle of Christian Obedience; and yet the enlivening and quickening Influences of the divine Spirit be necessary to render that Principle, of special Efficacy and Avail? Why then need these Things to be separated, and a Wonder to be made of it, what Mr. *Balch* means when he calls Assent to revealed Truths, the Root and Principle of Christian Practice?

After all you grant, that there is such a Faith as I speak of, and that it is the Faith of St. *James*, "A Faith which being without Works, is dead. Only you engage at the same Time "to maintain, that it is a Thing rather *similar* "to Faith, than Faith its self; the *Image* of it rather than "the Reality." Are you here correcting my Sermon, or the Apostle *James*? He calls it *Faith*, and I venture to call it Faith after him. No; say you, it is not Faith, but only something similar to Faith, the Image of it, &c. And will you enter the Lists with the Apostle, and maintain, that he did not understand the Use of Words?---All Men will here give it against you; for in Truth he uses the Word in its most proper, strict and literal Sense, while what you call *Faith*, is rather the *Obedience* of Faith, than the Thing itself: Or, Faith, only in a large, improper, figurative Sense, as it is the Fruit or Effect of Assent to revealed Truths.†

H

But

† Though I am not fond of human Authorities, and if I was, could easily swell this Pamphlet into a Folio; yet I can't help giving the Reader the following Paragraph from the pious and learned Bishop *Hopkins*, "As the Soul is the most noble, and most vital Principle of Man, and yet "is most unknown to him what it is, and how it operates; so Faith, "which

But you say, No ; “ for the meer naked Assent ” (i. e. which the Apostle *James* and Mr. *Balch* speak of) “ is rather an “ Effect of Education, Example, &c, than founded on an Apprehension of God’s Verity.” I answer, this is a great Mistake. It is Assent to *revealed Truths*, and so “ as it hath “ divine Revelation for its Object, it hath God’s Truth for “ a Motive and Security ;” as you say all *Theological Faith* has. But “ We utterly deny (say you) *that Faith of Assent* (i. e. “ which is the Effect of Education, Example, &c) to be the “ Root and Principle of Gospel-Holiness.” And who ever said it was ? But you say, “ Meer naked Assent we deny to “ be &c.” i. e. Meer naked Assent, is meer naked Assent, and when there is Nothing more than meer naked Assent, there is Nothing more than meer naked Assent. But what hinders, *Gentlemen*, but that Assent to revealed Truths, when it is alone and without Works, should be called *meer naked Assent* ; and yet when it has Works, be esteemed the Root and Principle of them, and so of Gospel Holiness and Obedience ? This you dare not deny ; and so have said just Nothing at all. You mention a *Kind of Assent*, which is not Assent to *revealed Truths*, but rather something *similar* to it ; and

“ which is the vital Principle of Christians, and by which the Just are
 “ said to live, is yet most unknown, both as to its Nature and Operations
 “ unto the Generality of them : Some place it in Assurance, some in
 “ Affiance and Recumbence ; some in one Act of Faith, and some in
 “ another ; which are either the Effects of Faith as true, or the Degrees
 “ of it as strong, rather than the proper and adequate Nature and Essence
 “ of it ; and then they mightily puzzle themselves how to accord and
 “ reconcile Faith and Obedience in carrying on the great Work of our
 “ Salvation, which yet were never at a Variance about it, but only in
 “ their mistaken *Hypothesis* : For what is Faith but Assent to a Testimo-
 “ ny ? The very Force and Import of the Word can carry no other
 “ Sense : And he that saith he believes, must needs mean he believes some
 “ Record or Testimony ; or else he speaks that which neither himself,
 “ nor any other can understand. Consequently therefore a divine Faith
 “ must be an Assent to a divine Testimony ; that is, to the Word of
 “ God contained in the holy Scriptures. But now if this Faith rest
 “ only in a bare and naked Assent to the Truth of divine Revelation, it
 “ is but historical and dogmatical ; which though it be a divine Faith in
 “ Respect of the Objects believed, yet it is but human and natural in
 “ Respect of its Principle and Motives. But when this Assent to the
 “ Truths of the Scripture is joined with proportionable Affections to
 “ those Truths, and doth excite us to Actions conformable to the Disco-
 “ veries of the divine Will, there this Faith is justifying and saving.
 “ And certainly this is not so very distant from Obedience, as to be tho’t
 “ hardly reconcileable with it.

not very similar neither, viz, Assent to this Proposition, 'My
 ' Parents and Ancestors were all in the Right before me, and
 ' my Friends and Neighbours are all in the Right about me,
 ' in believing *these* and *those* Things, and therefore I believe
 ' them too ;' and then you *utterly deny* that this is the Root
 and Principle of Gospel Holiness. Who do you oppose in
 this ? Not me, surely ? Nobody will charge me with this
 Kind of Assent, or with endeavouring to propagate it. I ne-
 ver speak favourably of it : But as I must see with my own
 Eyes, so long as I have any ; so I would have every Body else
 to do the same. And I cannot but wish you, *Gentlemen*, to look
 about you, and see, that this is not the *sandy* Foundation on
 which your own Assent is built for a Multitude of Things.
 May I not properly say, you are here fighting with your *own*
 Shadow ? What you ought to have denied, is, that *Assent* to
 revealed Truths, (viz, that real, unfeigned Assent, 'which as
 ' it has divine Revelation for its Object, so has the Truth of
 ' God for its Motive and Security') is or can be a *Principle* with-
 in a Man, by the *accompanying Influence* of the divine Spirit,
 inclining and disposing him to live and act as a Christian.
 This, I say, is what you should have *denied*, and *supported* the
 Denial of, in order to make out your Charge against my Ser-
 mon. And therefore as you have not done it, but have kept
 wide of it all along ; and dare not do it at last, you had as
 goods have said nothing at all.

And now I must needs say, I am in Pain for you while I
 transcribe what next follows, " You bless God that you are
 " from the Scriptures informed of a *better Faith* than my Ser-
 " mon has described." And then you go on to tell what Dis-
 coveries you have made.---I have carefully look'd it over ;
 and am willing and desirous that every Reader should do it ;
 though I don't think it needful to transcribe it for an Answer.
 But think it enough to say, that you have mentioned no one
 Thing as an Act or Property of Faith, but what is fairly con-
 tained in the Description I had given of it in the Page you
 refer to, viz, as the *Assent of the Mind to revealed Truths*, and
the Consent of the Will to be governed in a Conformity to them.
 And so whatever better Faith the Scriptures may have infor-
 med you of, you have not been able, either by your selves, or
 from others, to inform your Readers what it is. For after
 all that you have said, the Whole amounts to no more than
 this, ' That there must be *Assent and Consent*.' Trusting and
 depending,

depending, accepting Christ, owning his Right, *saying Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel*, and loving, chusing, and embracing the good Things offered in the Gospel; these and the like are all *Fruits* of Assent to revealed Truths, and are *implied* in a Consent to be governed in a Conformity to them.

Nor did I think it proper in the Subject I was upon, to launch out into large and particular Descriptions of these Things. I believe no judicious Reader would have liked my Sermon the better, had I done it; it was not the Point I had in View. And therefore, though "you hope my Sermon has not many *Approvers*," as it now stands, I believe if I had suited it to your Taste, I could not have promised my self more. For though you speak lightly of an impertinent *Observation*, saying somewhere "that you should not have *complained* in that *Case*," yet I am of the Mind, than an impertinent *Redundancy* is a *Fault*, as well as a *Defect* in the main Point: And tho' you had never complain'd, yet I should not have been easy with myself, had I knowingly been guilty of either.

And so I am come at length to the *last* Thing you complain of in the *Sermon*, viz. of my *misrepresenting* those who differ from me, p. 28. To this Purpose, "Your Readers are desired to take Notice, that I am pleased to impose upon you *One of my Kinds of Faith*; and then to dispute against it as insufficient alone to justify." And a little after, That instead of "proving your Notion of Faith unscriptural and erroneous, or that such a Faith is insufficient to Justification, --- Mr. *Balch* will needs have it, that we, who assert Faith only to justify, must mean his *meer naked Assent* to revealed Truths, and so build our Justification on this miserable Foundation." And again, in the next Page, --- "A Supposition that we place Justification in this meer naked Assent, &c, is the *Shadow* with which Mr. *Balch* fights throughout his Sermon. In Consequence of which, he implicitly reckons us with *Antinomians* and *Liberines*, who shut Christian Morality out of their Divinity; arguing against us all along, as if conflicting with those execrable Sects of Men. ---" All which is as wide from the Truth as any Thing can well be. And 'tis remarkable, that in a *Complaint of Misrepresentation*, when it wou'd be natural to think that Men should be a little on their Guard, you should make so gross an *One* your selves. Besides, the Complements which

which you sometimes pay me for *Penetration* and *Connection* of Thought, in this Case, lose all their Grace and Beauty. For what *Penetration* or *Connection* of Tho't can there be in a Performance, which " sets up one Kind of Faith, as a justifying Faith ; and then disputes against it as insufficient to justify ? " --- I had no need " to prove either that your Notion of Faith is unscriptural and erroneous ; or that such a Faith is insufficient to Justification. " I like your Notion of a justifying Faith well enough, as you have several Times given it in these your *Remarks* : And I had allowed in my Sermon, that taking Faith in the *large* Sense, in which 'tis often used in *Scripture*, and particularly in the Writings of *St. Paul*, it is the *Condition* of the *Gospel Covenant*, and consequently, sufficient to Justification and Salvation. Nor have I ever set up any *other* Kind of Faith, than this, as a justifying Faith ; nor said one Word against *this*, as insufficient to Justification.

I am far from supposing that " Those who assert Faith only " to justify, must mean *James's* meer naked Assent to revealed " Truths". On the contrary I believe, that they generally in that Case intend Faith in the *large* Sense of *St. Paul*, and include in the very Notion of it Christian Obedience and good Works. And therefore *These* are not the Men, " who " think diversely from me in the Point of Justification. " Nor do I " reckon them with *Antinomians* and *Libertines*, who " shut Christian Morality out of their Divinity. " All the Difference between me and this Sort of Men is, that they with *St. Paul* include in the Notion of a justifying Faith that Christian Obedience and moral Righteousness ; which I after *St. James* sometimes speak of, as necessary to be joined with Faith, i. e. with Assent to revealed Truths. And Nothing (I think) will be more obvious to a judicious Reader of your *Remarks*, and of my Sermon, than that you include in your Notion of Faith all that I ever contend for, as necessary to be joined with it ; taking the Word precisely for the *Belief* of the Gospel.

But yet after all, are there no *Antinomians* and *Libertines* in the Country, who do not take into their Notion of a justifying Faith, what you do, viz, " A cordial Entertainment of " the Truth as it is in *Jesus* ; a receiving the Truth in the " Love of it, particularly respecting Christ and the Redemption in him ; an hearty Reception of the Gospel-Saviour " in all his mediatorial Offices, with Trust and Confidence

in

“ in him ; by which Reception we are so far united to him,
 “ that we not only partake of his justifying Righteousness,
 “ but also have him living in us by his Spirit, as a Fountain
 “ of sanctifying Influences, whereby we are disposed and
 “ enabled to all holy Obedience and good Works ? ” How
 then do I fight with a Shadow ? --- And if there be *Antino-*
mians, and “ perhaps more in the *late* Times than before,”
 as you allow ; what need was there of your supposing, that I
 am “ arguing against *you* all along, as if conflicting with
 “ those execrable Sects of Men ? ”

Who you mean by *us* and *we* here, so often repeated in
 this Paragraph, I am much at a Loss to tell. Do you mean
us the Rev. Messieurs, WIGGLESWORTH and CHIPMAN ? I had
 no Tho't of you. Do you mean *us orthodox Divines*, who
 think Men to be *justified by Faith alone*, taking Faith in the
 Sense of St. Paul, or as you do in the Passage but now cited ;
 I am One of you ; and you had no need to have spoken thus
 in way of Opposition ; or to have mistrusted that I was argu-
 ing against you. Or, do you mean *us Friends* to the *good*
Work, and *Followers* of Mr. WHITEFIELD ? I never tho't, that
 all these were *Antinomians* : Tho' I believe that many of them
 are ; and that there is too much of a “ real and apparent De-
 “ fection from the *Form of sound Words*” in them generally ;
 and a Sort of *antinomianizing*, which to be sure, I have not been
 able to observe “ without some Degree of Indignation.”

You add a Clause to the above, “ And a *vindicating himself*,
 “ as one that suffered in his Reputation, for pleading the
 “ Cause of Gospel Obedience,” which I can't take kindly at
 your Hands. The Time may be, when you your selves may
 suffer in your Reputation, if not for pleading the Cause of
 Gospel-Obedience, yet for pleading the Cause of that Gospel-
 Faith, which you have described (which you know has its Ene-
 mies, as well as Gospel-Obedience ; especially when they per-
 ceive that Gospel Obedience is really included in it) and if ever
 this should happen to any great Degree ; I am persuaded you
 would not take it well, if *vindicating* yourselves should be object-
 ed as a Crime.---I shall only upon this Occasion put you in Mind
 of that Text, Job 6. 15. *My Brethren have dealt deceitfully as a*
Brook, and as the Stream of Brooks they pass away ; and leave it
 with the *foregoing Verse*, to have that Effect upon you, which
 it may please God to give it.

You go on, P. 29. “ That it may appear we do not wrong
 “ Mr.

“ Mr. *Balch*, in this our Remark upon his Representations and Reasonings, we shall recite a few Sentences from his Discourse.” This I like very well. And then you cite from Pag. 15, of my Sermon, these Words, ‘ He (i. e. the Apostle *Paul* in Rom. 3. 28.) asserts the Necessity of Faith, and the Sufficiency of that alone in order to *Salvation*. But then, methinks, we may easily apprehend, that by Faith, when thus used, he must needs intend *Christianity*; not only a believing, but a conforming our selves to the Gospel of Christ, ----not only an Assent to the Doctrines and confiding in the Promises, but also a Consent to be governed by the Rules and Precepts of the same.----A living *soberly, righteously, and godlily, in the World*, as well as looking for the blessed Hope and trusting in the Mercy of God through Christ for eternal Happiness. And if so, then by *Deeds of the Law* he cannot possibly mean (what *Libertines* and *Antinomians* would fain have him mean) *moral Righteousness* and *Obedience*; but he must intend the *Jewish* Rites and Ceremonies.’ And does this prove what you bring it for? Does it prove, that I don’t hold the Sufficiency of *Faith* alone, as St. *Paul* uses the Word, in order to Justification and Salvation? I think, quite the contrary; and that you might have known from this single Passage, if there had been no other to the same Purpose, that there was no Difference between us in this Respect; in asserting the Justification of Men by *Faith alone*, as you use the Word after St. *Paul*.---And had you admitted this Conviction, how much Trouble and Pains might it have saved you? All your Quotations at least from *Confessions* of *Faith*, &c, might have been spared, without the least Disadvantage to your Performance; unless perhaps abating the Bulk, the Shew of Learning, and the like.

But you say upon this Passage cited from my Sermon, “Had Mr. *Balch* distinguish’d here, and said, that *Libertines* and *Antinomians* abuse the Interpretation, which we put upon St. *Paul*’s Words, to wicked Error and Licentiousness, it would have been, tho’ altogether impertinent to his Purpose, yet a true Observation, and we should not have complained: But as his Words now stand, we can interpret him no otherwise, than as meaning, that they are *Libertines* and *Antinomians*, who would fain have the Apostle intend, that a Man is justified by Faith without the Deeds of the moral Law.” And what then? Is there no Difference between a Man’s thinking

thinking this or that to be the true Interpretation of a Text, and his *fain having* this or that to be the Interpretation of it, which wou'd suit with his *carnal* Inclinations and Desires? I might well enough say, that *Libertines* and *Antinomians* would *fain have* the Apostle mean moral Righteousness and Obedience, as what he excluded under the Phrase *Deeds of the Law*, from their *Enmity* thereto; without intimating in the least, that *all* are *Libertines* and *Antinomians*, who interpret the Apostle *Paul* differently from what I do: Which indeed was the furthest from my Tho'ts of any Thing in the World. If any include moral Goodness and Righteousness in the Term *Faith*, or by Faith understand all the principal, essential Acts of Christian Obedience, and such a renewed and sanctified Temper of Soul, as by the constant-Presence and Influence of the divine Spirit, will not fail of disposing a Man to all holy Obedience and good Works; tho' they think all this excluded under the other Terms, *Deeds of the Law*, yet all that can be said in this Case is, that they make the Apostle speak in a very inconsistent and self contradictory Way: But it will not from hence follow, that they are *Antinomians*: Nor is there the least Hint in the Passage you have cited from my Sermon, looking that way.

Yet you proceed, " And this injurious Representation is " stronger yet in the following *Passage*." viz. taken from p. 20. of my Sermon in these Words, ' But can the Scriptures ' teach (can they be supposed to teach) that *relying* on the ' Mercy of God and the Merits of Christ for Salvation, is *all* ' that God requires of us? Can it be made the only Condition ' of Happiness, that we fondly and certainly expect and depend upon it? Can it be made the Design of the Revelation ' God has given us, to dissolve the Obligations of *natural* Religion: And the End of our Saviour's Appearing be, *not to* ' take away Sin, and destroy the Works of the Devil; but to set ' Men down easy in their Sins, and so leave them to serve the ' Devil without the least Fear of their Maker's Displeasure ' upon that Account?' The injurious Representation you here complain of, as *strong* as it is, is what I believe No Body ever yet discovered without the Help of your Spectacles.

The judicious Remark you make upon this Passage to lay open the Naughtiness of it, is this, " The great Subject which " Mr. Balch insists upon in this Sermon is, that Gospel Obedience

“ dience or good Works have a Part in Man’s Justification ;
 “ in Opposition to those who think, that the Scriptures, and
 “ more especially St. Paul’s Epistles, assert our Justification by
 “ Faith without these moral Works.”

But do any, unless the grossest *Antinomians*, think that the Scriptures, and more especially St. Paul’s Epistles, assert our Justification by *such a Faith* as is described in the Passage you have cited from me ? ‘ *Relying on the Mercy of God, and the Merits of Christ for Salvation, as all that God requires ---- Fondly and certainly expecting and depending upon Happiness, as the only Condition of it.*’ ---- If this, *Gentlemen*, is the *Faith*, you hold Men are justified by, without moral Righteousness and Obedience ; these are home Strokes upon you : But if none but *Antinomians* ever held this ; then your Remark falls to the Ground, and the injurious Representation vanishes. And so you might have spared what follows in the same Paragraph, viz, “ And therefore, either these Expostulations of
 “ his are all foreign to his *Purpose*, or else their Intent is to
 “ insinuate, that such as affirm Justification by Faith,” (i. e. by such a Faith as is described in the Quotation) “ without
 “ the concurring Influence of the Works of the moral Law,
 “ are guilty of all the black Things contained in those Interrogatories, viz, making divine *Revelation* to dissolve the Obligations of *natural Religion*, denying that our Saviour appeared to destroy the Works of the *Devil* ; and making it
 “ the End of his coming to set Men down easy in their Sins,
 “ and so leave them to serve the Devil without the least Fear
 “ of displeasing their Maker.” I am intirely willing to let it stand as it is, and that the Reader should now judge, who has made the *injurious Representation*, You or I.

Another Passage you cite from my Sermon is, “ This is
 “ certainly one of the greatest Indignities offered to the Gospel of our Saviour, that because there are several Passages
 “ in it which speak with Contempt of the Jewish Rites and Ceremonies, when Men were fond of them, after they were
 “ abolished ; and which blame those who adhered to them, after God had appointed and revealed a new Way of serving him and obtaining his Favour ; therefore to think that
 “ Christian Obedience may be treated in the same Manner, and that those who adhere to the Gospel of Christ, and contend
 “ for a sincere Conformity to its Precepts, are alike faulty Self-Justiciaries.” Upon which you remark ; “ All this also is
 I founded

“founded upon the same *unaccountable* Supposition, viz, That
 “all they who call Men faulty *Self-Justiciaries*, on their ex-
 “pecting to be justified *for their Obedience*; do bestow the
 “same odious Terms on those who are conscientious to yield
 “Obedience.” Who they are, that expect to be justified
for their Obedience, I cannot tell; but (alluding to a Passage of
 your’s in the next Page) who they are that bestow the *same*
 odious Terms upon those who are conscientious to yield Obe-
dience, as if they expected to be justified for it, “I believe
 “your Readers need not go far to find.” For if they look
 into your 36th Page, they will find there *exemplified* the very
 Thing which you here call an *unaccountable Supposition*. Up-
 on Paul’s professing himself to be *blameless, touching the Right-*
eousness which is in the Law, you reply upon him close, “That
 “whosoever goeth about to establish that Righteousness, doth
 “not submit to the Righteousness of God; and that so long as any
 “Man shall imagine, that he may be justified by the Righteous-
 “ness, which is of the Law, verily *Christ shall profit him nothing*.”
 Did he say any Thing about his expecting to be *justified for his*
Righteousness, in the Passage alledged? If not, then in Effect
 you call him a faulty *Self-Justiciary* for only professing a con-
 scientious Obedience to the Law of God.----But more of this
 perhaps in its Place.---At present, how you thought this Quo-
 tation to your Purpose, or what Misrepresentation you found
 in my Words, I cannot conceive; unless you imagine that
 there are none in the Country who treat Christian Obedience
 with Contempt, and call those faulty *Self-Justiciaries*, who only
 contend for a sincere Conformity to the Precepts of Christ?
 That there are such, and that it is a great *Fault*, is all the Sup-
 position I made, or needed to make: And the contrary I
 should think, whoever makes it, is a much more *unaccountable*
One: And your’s, is an infinitely more *unaccountable* one still;
 that I should suppose “that *all* who call Men faulty *Self-Jus-*
 “*ticiaries* on their expecting to be justified for their Obedi-
 “*ence*, bestow the same odious Terms on those who are con-
 “*scientious* to yield Obedience.” What Need was there
 that I should suppose *All* to be guilty of this Evil? Must *all*
Men be *Drunkards* or *Whoremongers* to justify a Minister in
 warning People against those *Crimes*!--- How *unaccountable*
 is your Talk!

To proceed; the next Passage you cite is this, ‘Yet if a
 ‘Man talks of Obedience, and pleads the Necessity of a good
 Life;

‘ Life ; he is immediately going about to establish his own Righteousness, or is seeking for Justification as it were by the Works of the Law.’ To what End you cite it I know not ; unless for the Sake of the following Remark ; “ We heartily acknowledge the Necessity of Obedience and a good Life ; and if Mr. Balch should talk and preach ever so often and warmly for them,---we should not be offended : But if he make this Obedience or good Works a Condition of our receiving Christ’s Righteousness for Justification, we will not clear him of going about to establish his own Righteousness, or seeking for Justification as it were by Works of the Law.”

And if you, Gentlemen, make Faith the Condition of our receiving Christ’s Righteousness for Justification ; is it not the same Thing ? Can you be cleared any more of going about to establish your own Righteousness, or of seeking for Justification as it were by the Works of the Law : Especially when you acknowledge that the Faith you speak of, is a *Work* ; and I suppose, will acknowledge too, that it is our own Work, as much as any of the Works of Christian Obedience are : And more especially still, when by Obedience in this Case, I intend exactly and precisely the same Thing which you intend by Faith ; and have at least as good Right to call it by *this Name* as you by the *other* ? ’Tis surprizing to me that Men should lay such Stress upon meer Sounds.---If Obedience should be supposed to be the Condition of our receiving Christ’s Righteousness for Justification, are we any more in that Case saved for our Obedience ; than if Faith is supposed to be the Condition, we are saved for our Faith ? Certainly we are saved for neither of them as the *meritorious Cause*. And therefore let which will of them (and there is no other Difference than in Name, between the Faith or the Obedience which is saving ; I say, let which will of them be supposed the Condition of our being interested in the justifying Righteousness of Christ, and in the justifying Grace of God ; there is no Manner of Pretence in this Case for any Thing like a Man’s going about to establish his own Righteousness, or his seeking for Justification as it were by the Works of the Law. And I must needs say, that I do still think it a profane Abuse of Scripture to speak after such a Manner.

Which brings me to the next Passage, viz, ‘ Certainly such may be thought, (and cannot but be thought,) to have a very great Degree of Enmity to good Works, who will venture thus to load them with Disgrace, at the Expence

‘ Expenſe of ſuch a profane Abufe of Scripture.’ “ But
 “ who are they (ſay you) that manifeſt ſuch Enmity
 “ to good Works ? Why, they (you reply) that *will*
 “ *not allow them a Place in Man’s Juſtification* ; though they
 “ at the ſame Time plead the *Neceſſity* of them as much as
 “ Mr. Balch doth.” That is, you give this as my Meaning.
 But how groſs is the Miſrepresentation ! Juſt as if thoſe I was
 contending with, acknowledged and pleaded the *Neceſſity* of
 good Works ; but I was not ſatisfied with that, unleſs they
 might be *allowed a Place in Man’s Juſtification* ! Whereas, on
 the contrary, their *Neceſſity* is all that I ever mention ; diſ-
 claiming their *Meritoriousneſs* ; and never once in all the *Diſ-*
course making Uſe of any ſuch Phraſe, as that which you would
 here lead your Readers to imagine muſt have been the Burden
 of it. ’Tis true indeed (and this may be, I ſuppoſe, what you
 aim at) I was not ſatisfied with the Office which ſome had af-
 ſigned to good Works, *viz, only or principally* to juſtify our
 Faith in the Sight of Men. The *Neceſſity* of good Works,
 of Chriſtian Obedience, of keeping the Commands of God,
 &c, only or chiefly with a View to the Eye of Man, and to
 render our *Profeſſion* of a juſtifying Faith *credible*, is with me
 a perfect *Solecism*. If they have no other *Neceſſity* allowed
 them than this ; I think ’tis infinitely to their Diſparagement.
 But of this perhaps I have ſaid enough before.

Another Paſſage you cite from my Sermon is this, ‘ Let us
 ‘ not then be drawn into the leaſt Contempt of Good Works,
 ‘ how bitterly and vehemently ſoever any may decry them,
 ‘ and us upon that account : But let us ſtill *ſhew our Faith*
 ‘ *by our Works* and challenge our Adverſaries to ſhew their’s,
 ‘ if they can, without them.’ Upon which you ſay, “ We
 “ are not thoſe Adverſaries that ever yet ſpoke or tho’t con-
 “ temptuouſly of Good Works : So much greater Friends
 “ are we to Good Works than Mr. Balch, that in our Divinity
 “ we provide and acknowledge a Principle, whence they may
 “ flow ; whereas he owns no ſuch Thing. But in reſpect
 “ of *Juſtification*, we do indeed think of them with Con-
 “ tempt, *leſt we ſhould put Contempt upon THE GRACE OF GOD,*
 “ *AND THE REDEMPTION WHICH IS IN JESUS CHRIST.*” And
 why do you not for the ſame Reason, think of Faith likewise
 with Contempt in reſpect of Juſtification ? Is it not as *wrong*
 to place our *own* Faith in the Room of the Grace of God,
 or of the Redemption which is in Jeſus Chriſt ; as to
 place

place our Works, or our Obedience there? Most certainly it is. And therefore I may say here, that I am a so much greater Friend to the Grace of God, and the Redemption which is in Jesus Christ, than you are; that I not only take Care to keep, *Works* out of the Place of either of them, but *Faith* likewise: Which you do not; or at least, which you appear not sufficiently to do. But you are greater Friends (it seems) to Good Works, than Mr. *Balch* is. i. e. plainly thus, you hold they are necessary to our present Comfort and Credit, Mr. *Balch*, that they are necessary to Acceptance with God and eternal Life. Now as our present Comfort and Credit are of greater Importance than the Favour of God and eternal Life; so much greater Friends are you to Good Works, than Mr. *Balch* is---- If this is not the *plain English* of what you say, *viz*, "You never yet tho't or spake contemptuously of " Good Works, but in respect of Justification you do indeed " think of them with Contempt," I don't know what plain English is. For if they are no Part of the Way we are to be found in, in order to our pleasing God and securing his Favour thro' Christ; there remains Nothing of Importance (at least, comparatively) in respect of which we can think of them with Honour. But enough of this has been said before; ---- as also of the Principle which in my Divinity (if I may learn to speak after you) is provided and acknowledged for their Performance, equally as in yours, *viz*, the sincere Belief of the Gospel.

There is one Expression more in your Remarks upon the Sermon, that One can hardly help taking Notice of; and that is, just at going off, "Tho' we pretend not (you say) " to judge between him [Mr. *Balch*] and his aggrieved Bre- " thren, having never heard the Cause, yet we are sure, *such* " *Preaching* as we find in the Sermon we are now concerned " with, would not be *pleasing* to us." In Return to which I will not say, that if your *Preaching* is not better than your *Remarks* are, 'tis likely I should be as little pleased with *that*, as you wou'd be with *mine*: But shall only inform you, that how useful a Hint soever you might think, this wou'd be to my People; it has hitherto had no Effect: Not One has left my *Preaching* upon it. ---- And so I leave you to reap all the Satisfaction your own Reflections can give you upon this Part of your Performance, and pass on to the other.

You proceed *secondly*, after your Remarks upon the Sermon,

mon, to bestow your Animadversions upon *some unsound Points of Doctrine* (as you are pleased to call them) which you find rehearsed and defended by me in a *Pamphlet*, &c. And respecting these *Articles*, you think I shall have no Reason to complain, "if you sometimes consider the Doctrines contained in them, with Relation to the Doctrines delivered in the Sermon already remark'd upon, and if you compare my *Explications* therewith." I have Nothing against this, if you don't in the first Place *take it for granted without Evidence*, that the Doctrines delivered in the Sermon are bad; and then make use of *that Evidence* to prove that the Doctrines contained in the Articles are so too. Otherwise I am willing that every Thing of mine should be compared together, as well as with the holy Scriptures: For if a Man is not consistent with himself, he is justly to be suspected of *Unsoundness* somewhere or other.

The *first* Article of this Kind, rehearsed and defended by me against my accusing Brethren, was this, 'that Communion with God consists in receiving Blessings and returning Thanks.' This, with what I said upon it to the Church, I at length tho't my self obliged to *publish*; that all the Country (if they pleased) might judge upon it.

You have made your Remarks; and express your Uneasiness I think principally for these *two* Things; *first* that I should "suffer so *defective* a Description [of Communion with God] to drop from me at any time." And *secondly* That I should "seem loth [by my Answer] to give it up at last."

As to the *former* I would say, that you seem to have a very defective Notion about this Matter of the *Articles*. I was not mine *own Chuser*, either as to the Things themselves, or the Manner in which those Things should be expressed, which my accusing Brethren bro't against me. 'Tis possible I might discourse a Quarter of an Hour, upon the Head of Communion with God, at the Time this Article was pick'd up. It was never pretended, that the *whole* Discourse was bro't to the Church: Nor was it at all likely, that the best Things I might say, should be remembred with *that View*. Now that those I discoursed with, were pleased to remember or rehearse no more than this, was certainly none of my Fault. And therefore your complaining of it, as a *defective* Description, is (I think) very unjust; since you had no Reason to believe, it was *all* that was offered at that Time. I suppose I might say,

say, as in my *Answer*, ' That Communion with God intends
 ' a gracious Intercourse or Commerce between him and his
 ' sinful Creatures here on Earth.' This you seem to approve
 of. ---- Yet give me Leave to tell you, that if I had said no
 more than this, my Hearers had been little the wiser for it.
 I therefore tho't it my Duty to explain what I meant by the
 Term *Intercourse* or *Commerce*. And in doing this, I suppose,
 I might say what gave Occasion for the Article, *viz*, that by
 Intercourse or Commerce in this Case, we might understand
 Something like this, ' Our receiving Blessings from God, and
 ' returning him our Thanks,' or that it might be conceived
 of thereby.

But tho' I tho't it needful to explain the Word *Intercourse*
 or *Commerce*, yet I confess I never tho't of telling my Hearers,
 that by giving Thanks in this Case, I did not mean " the
 " bare *Opus operatum*, the meer outward Performance of the
 " Duty, without any Grace in the Heart ;" or to caution
 them " against this Method of Duty as being practis'd in the
 " *Romish Church*." And if this was a *Fault*, so be it. I can
 hardly think however, that you have always avoided it your
 selves, as often as you have had Occasion to mention
 giving Thanks to God.

The *other* Thing you complain of, or rather profess your
 selves sorry for, is " to see, that however Mr. Balch hath at
 " length explain'd himself more satisfactorily upon Commu-
 " nion with God; yet this Explication is accompanied with
 " so much Justification of the Terms of his old defective
 " Description. He seems loth to give it up at last. Which
 " Fondness of his for it, gives (say you) further Reason to
 " think, that it was his own real Off-spring." As to this
 I wou'd say, I am sorry too, to see your *Distinguishing Faculty*
 here so much *fails* you, when you *abound* in it at other Times
 and upon other Occasions. For *how* did I *justify* the old de-
 fective Description? *How* was I loth to give it up; or in what
 Respect did I express my Fondness for it? Not as a full, clear,
 and perfect Description of Communion with God. I never
 pretended any Thing like it. But I was loth to give it up,
 i. e. to own it was such an *Error*, as a Person might be justified
 in bringing against a Minister to the Church. And I think
 you have not charged it, as an Error of *this Kind*; tho' you
 say, " I could not in Reason wonder, that any *intelligent* Hear-
 " er should *dislike* it." I believe no intelligent Hearer would
 have disliked it, with what accompanied it at the same Time.

Or

Or if he had disliked it, would have thought there was any Thing so fundamentally erroneous in it, as to render it fit to be treated as a Matter of Offence and *Charge* against the Person who had said it, and could be thought to have said it with no other View, but to give the best Instruction he could in a Thing of great Moment :---A proper *Indignation* at this, naturally drew from me all I said in Way of Justification of this Article ; and not any *Fondness* for it as being *my own real Offspring*. 'Tis true, I never denied it : And the whole Drift of my *Answer* shews, that I was not so much ashamed of it, as of those who brought it as a Charge against me.--- It was also natural upon such an Occasion, to make Use of the Names of others, who had said at least as uninstruative, if not similar Things, upon the same Subject. For this End I cited Dr. *Manton*, according to whom Communion with God consisted in *Donatives* and *Duties*.

But you seem to think I wronged the *Doctor* in this Citation. To clear up which Matter, I assure you, that you have not hit upon the Place I referred to. I never saw his Sermon on *Cant. i. 12.* which you speak of. The Volume of his I am in Possession of, is upon the 119 *Psalms* ; and there if you will look into his 784th Page, you may find these Words ; “ Our Commerce with God is in *Donatives* and *Duties*.” That he has said any Thing better upon the same Subject *there* or *elsewhere*, is Nothing to the Purpose. For so had I, at the same Time I was accused for saying, It consisted in receiving Blessings and returning Thanks. I was not therefore looking out for the best Things said upon the Subject ; but to find something no better, and pretty parallel with what I was charged with : And which yet was capable of a proper Explication ; and if it was not sufficiently descriptive of the Thing by *its self alone*, might yet be deemed so, with the Enlargments that might accompany it.

I shall say but little as to what you offer under the *second* Article, *viz*, That there was no Need of applying the Blood “ of Christ for our Cleansing.” This was such a Charge as all that knew me, at first Sight concluded must be a *Mistake*. You yourselves don't think it proper “ to accuse me as guilty “ according to the Charge of the Article.” But you with I had in my other Writings, especially the Sermon I have considered, “ made Provision of a sutable and sufficient Method “ of applying the Merits of Christ's Blood. For we think
(say

“(say you) his Faith will utterly fail of performing this Office.” This has been already considered ; and I think I have shewn, that the *Faith* described in my Sermon, is at least as sufficient for the Application of the Merits of Christ’s Death, as any that you have described. Indeed your Descriptions of Faith are not without their Defects : Whereas the Description which I gave, was large enough to take in every Thing. Assent to the Truths of natural and revealed Religion, and the proper *Fruits* and *Effects* of that Assent, must include every spiritual and gracious Acting of the Soul, that can be conceived of. Thus, if I believe that *Jesus is the Christ*, the Son of God, the Saviour of Men ; the proper Fruit or Effect of this Assent is, that I receive and submit to him as such.---If I believe that he died a propitiatory Sacrifice for Sin, to render it consistent with the Honour of the divine Perfections and Government, to pardon and receive to Favour penitent, returning Sinners ; the proper Fruit and Effect of this is, that I am led to Repentance thereby, and hope in the Mercy of God accordingly.---If I believe that by the *Merit* of his Death and Intercession with the Father, he has obtained the Promise of the *Spirit* to be bestowed upon all his sincere Followers, to enable them to mortify Sin, and live to God ; the proper Fruit or Effect of this is, that I sincerely and in good Earnest set about the *Business of Religion*, depending upon God for, and continually asking of him, those mighty and powerful Aids of his Grace, without which I am altogether insufficient thereto ; and so of Assent to every other Truth, whether of natural or revealed Religion.* If you can shew any Act of Faith or of

* To this Purpose the learned and pious Author before cited in his Sermon upon *true Happiness* “ saving Faith (says he) is a firm Assent unto the Truths of God revealed in the holy Scriptures, working in us proportionable Affections and Actions. He who so believes the *Glory of Heaven* as to have his Endeavours thereby quickened to use his utmost Diligence for the obtaining of it : He who so believes the *Torments of Hell* as thereby to be terrified from doing any Thing that might expose him to so great and fearful a Condemnation : He who so believes the *Attributes of God*, as thereby to be excite to fear him for his Greatness, to love him for his Goodness, to imitate him in his Bounty, Purity, and Holiness : He who so believes the *All-sufficiency, Merits, and mediatory Office of Jesus Christ*, as thereby to be engaged with all his Soul to love him, to trust in him, to rely upon him alone for Salvation, and to yield to him all sincere Obedience ; such an one’s Faith is saving and justifying. So that you see (says he) that there is no such Discord between Faith and Works, as some would imagine.”

Obedience, which is not included herein, or in the Fruits and Effects of such Assent ; then I will acknowledge that my Faith is defective and insufficient. But if you can do nothing of this ; then I think, you ought not only to desist from such Complaints for the future, but to be heartily ashamed that you ever made any : Especially when your own Faith, as copiously and as many Times as you are pleased to describe it, has yet some essential Acts of Faith, which are not included in the Description ; as I could easily shew, if it were needful. Yet I charge not your Faith with being defective and insufficient ; because, though you have not mention'd those Acts of Faith, nor included them in your Descriptions ; yet I make no Doubt but that they were presupposed by you : And I think it of more Importance at present to put you in Mind of the Defects in your *Charity*.

How unbecoming, how unbrotherly, and how unchristian-like is it, that you insinuate such Things, as you do, under this Article : --- That truly there might be Something more at Bottom than I was willing shou'd come out : 'Tis well if what I said, " be the whole Truth relating to that Affair : " And that notwithstanding I speak so honourably and strongly of the Name of Christ and his Merits, I may yet be one of those wicked Wretches who make a Jest of them ; This is certainly such Jealousy as Nothing cou'd remove or satisfy. " Mr. *Balch* will permit us to say, that there have been Persons who spake as honourably and strongly of Christ's Name and Merits as himself doth ; acknowledging also with him that there is no other Name than that of Jesus whereby Salvation can be obtained ; and yet have made a Jest of the *Application* of those Merits ; *i. e.* the particular Application of them to the Person to be justified, which is performed on God's Part by *Imputation*, and on Man's Part by the Acceptance of Faith. " And do you think, *Gentlemen*, that because there may have been such wicked Persons, you had a good and clear Warrant to intimate, as if I might be such an One ? ---- Or do you think, that all who may really make a Jest of your Doctrine about the Imputation of Christ's Merits and the alone justifying Influence of Faith, must from hence be supposed, alike to make a Jest of the *Scripture-Doctrine* in those Matters ? --- For my own Part I don't know how ridiculous your own Doctrine may be in those Respects : But I believe the Scripture Doctrine of the Application of Christ's Merits, is infinitely *wise* and *reasonable*. And it is with

with the greatest Indignation that I see, a Religion infinitely wise and kind, calculated to approve its self to the Reason of Mankind, and to do them the greatest Good, exposed to Contempt by the foolish *Alterations* and *Additions* of Men. I wonder Men are not ashamed to make their own *Representations* of and *Additions* to the Gospel of Christ, of equal Importance with the Gospel its self: As you have here given but too much Reason to have it supposed, that you think there is no Room for the Application of Christ's Merits, but just in your own Way and according to your own Scheme. I wish Men wou'd consider, what Injury is done to the Religion of Christ by such Bigotry. --- Certainly it is no Service to Mankind to have *that Religion*, in their Compliance with which all their best Interests are so deeply involved, represented in such a Manner, with such Alterations and Additions, that it can't be defended on a solid Foundation. *

I proceed to the *third* Article, viz, ' That *Paul* was a good Man before he was converted as he went to *Damascus*; and ' that *that* Conversion was only from *Judaism* to *Christianity*. ' As this is a Matter of no Importance, whatever weak Minds may conceive of it; and as you concede that it is not essential to Christianity either to believe or disbelieve according to this Article; if your Performance *in general* needed no Apology to be made for it, yet I should think, that the *Length* of this Part of it *in particular*, did. However, as you have engaged me upon this Head with a considerable Waste of Learning, I don't know that it will be amiss, if I spend a little Time in tracing what you have offered.

You *first* bring one Argument *against* his being a good Man

* The excellent Dr. *Watts's* Advice to this Purpose deserves to be had in everlasting Remembrance. " Let us (says he) have a Care of Mingle the pure Religion of Christ with human Additions — For this corrupt Mixture will endanger our losing the whole. Pure and simple Christianity will bear a rational and solid Defence; and we shall abide stedfast in the Faith and Profession of it. But if we admit of human Mixtures, if we receive such Articles of Faith, or Rules of Duty as are no where contained in the Gospel, and call this the *Christian* Religion; as we shall give the *Adversaries* of Christianity the greatest Advantages against us, so our own Reason and Conscience may some time or other be convinc'd of the Vanity and Absurdity of such additional Matters; and that may prove a dangerous Temptation to us to question the whole. " —

at that Time: And *then* you endeavour to *weaken* those, which in my necessary Defence I bro't for it.

The Argument you bring against *Paul's* being a good Man at that Time, is *what he did against the Christian Religion and the Professors of it in its infant-State*. This you call his want of *Love to the Brethren*, and “ a rooted, implacable Enmity towards them that lived in all good Conscience before God, “ in a far better Sense than he had done.” But it does not appear that he had any Enmity at all towards them that lived in all good Conscience before God ; If a Professor of Christianity should *suffer* as a *Murderer*, or as a *Thief*, or an *Evil-doer* in any other Instance against the Law ; would it be proper to represent the Magistrate ordering the Punishment, as doing it from his *Enmity towards Christians* ? So altho' the Persons whom *Paul* persecuted, lived as innocent and blameless Lives as he had done, and perhaps much better ; yet he did Nothing against them *in that Respect*, but because he tho't they were overturning the Religion of the Country, and introducing a new *Heresy* among them.

Nay, it might be from his *Love to the Brethren of the Jewish Religion*, which he tho't the only true Religion, and they the only Persons who lived in all good Conscience before God, that he did what he did against the *Christians*. All that is certain is, that he was *bigotted* to, and *zealous* for the Religion he had been educated in, to such a Degree that it had not hitherto suffered him calmly and fairly to *examine* the Evidences for Christianity. --- What Advantages he had had for this, we can't very well tell : But we know, the Christian Religion was yet *new*, and lay under many Prejudices : It was before his Eyes were opened to see the Truth and Excellency of Christianity ; and when *he verily tho't with himself he ought to do many Things contrary to the Name of Jesus of Nazareth*. Now you have not ventured to affirm, ‘ That a good Man in ‘ these Circumstances under a false and mistaken Notion of ‘ Things, can't possibly have an Hand in any criminal Persecution.’ Had you proved this, or attempted it, it had been more to the Purpose of your *Argument*, than barely expressing your Confidence, “ that in some Sense *Paul* was not in *Christ*” [i. e. was not a Christian] “ before his Journey to *Damascus*,” which no Body ever imagined.

I am as much against *Bigotry*, and the usual Effect of it, *Persecution*, as perhaps any Person in the World ; yet I can't presently give a Man up for a *bad* Man, who appears too much
tinctured

tinged with those Vices. I fear, if this should once be admitted, a great Number of Those whom we have been always wont to esteem some of the best of Men, must be struck out of the Catalogue of Saints.

Besides, it does not appear, that *Paul's* Zeal and Bigotry were vented against Those who only differed from him in some little Circumstances about the same Religion; as the Zeal and Bigotry of too many Others have been: Which certainly makes his Fault to be less in that Respect, than theirs.

But I hasten to consider what you have offered with the other View, *namely*, to *weaken* the Arguments which I brought, as having a Shew of *Probability* on the Side of his being a good Man; though I never pretended they carried the Matter beyond all Dispute.

And here you say,

1. " That his *living in all good Conscience before God* (*Acts* " 23. 1.) was insufficient for this End, i. e. to prove he was " a good Man: As you think will appear, if we consider in " what Sense *Paul* used that *Phrase*." I need not repeat *here* all you have said under this: For after first *Affirming*, and then *Denying* a good Conscience in a *legal* Sense; and then describing a good Conscience in an *evangelical* Sense; and then saying several odd Things about a good Conscience in a *moral* Sense, as if *Morality* did not extend, as *Christianity* does, to a Man's Actions in general; but that to a moral good Conscience it might suffice only to have behaved well in some particular Instance: I say after these Things, you at Length come to give your Opinion, that this was the Case of *Paul* before his Conversion in his Journey to *Damascus*, i. e. that the good Conscience he professed to have *lived in*, did not respect the Course of his Life in general, but only some particular Actions of it, about which he was called in Question.

You argue after this Manner, " That the Greek Word " translated, *I have lived*, has no Reference to the Series or " Course of his Life in general; but only to his Behaviour " considered as a *Citizen*, or Member of the Commonwealth " of the *Jews*; as appears to learned Men from the Notation " thereof. However he had lived in other Respects, yet he " had been no *Mover of Sedition*, he had not attempted to *raise* " up the People, either in the *Synagogue*, or in the *City*. He never " went about to *profane the Temple*, nor had he done to the *Jews* " any *Wrong*. But with Respect to these Particulars, had be- " haved with all good Conscience before God until that very Day.

Nor

“ Nor can we imagine (say you) *Paul* should, in his Answer before the Council, attempt to clear himself of any Thing that he was *not accused of*; or that he was yet so much of a *Pharisee* as to boast of a holy and spotless Life from his Infancy, before the Council, when he was not accused of any Thing but of transgressing the Law of the *Jews*.” All this, *Gentlemen*, is vastly more plausible than solid. For whatever you may think of it the Apostle certainly did intend, though not to *boast* of a holy and spotless Life from his Infancy, yet to plead a very innocent and harmless Life from his Infancy: And a good Argument it was to the present Case in Hand.

You seem to think it absurd, that when he was only accused of transgressing the Law of the *Jews*, he should attempt to clear himself of any Thing he was not accused of. But the Apostle was of another Mind: He thought a good Argument might be drawn from the *general* Course of his Life, which had been very blameless and exemplary, to render his Innocency probable in the Particulars that were now complained of. And happy is the Man, who when under like Reproach and Obloquy in any doubtful Instances of Behaviour in some Matter of nice *Questions* or *Strifes of Words*, can appeal as the Apostle did, to all that knew him, for the Goodness and Unexceptionableness of his general Conversation!

If you will look into the 26th Chap. of *Acts*, it will no longer remain a Matter in Dispute, whether the Apostle did use this Argument; *ψ. 2. I think my self happy, King Agrippa, because I shall answer for my self this Day, before thee, touching all the Things whereof I am accused of the Jews.* And then *ψ. 4.* he begins his Apology, *My Manner of Life from my Youth, which was at the first among mine own Nation at Jerusalem, know all the Jews, &c.* Who can help observing here, even without the Assistance of a *Commentator*, that when he was called to answer touching the Things whereof he was accused of the *Jews*, he expressly pleads the Manner of his Life from his Youth? Which spoils all this fine Talk of yours. For if he did this before *Agrippa*, why might he not do it before the Council? Nay, the very Expression of the Text alledged, (*Acts 23. 1.*) obliges us to this Interpretation. *I have lived in all good Conscience before God until this Day.* Until this Day, *i. e.* from my Youth until this Day: Or where will you fix the other Term?—And the learned *Criticism* you mention from the *Notation* of the Greek Word translated, *I have lived,*

is too weak to bear any Stress to be laid upon it. The very same Word is used by this Apostle in his Epistle to the *Philippians*, 1 Chap. 27. which we there render, *Let your Conversation be, Only let your Conversation be as becomes the Gospel.* --- Now will any Body imagine meerly from the Notation of a Word, that the Apostle there meant to exhort the *Philippians* only to see to it, that as *Members of the Commonwealth* they lived as the Gospel requires? --- And there is even less Reason for restraining the Word to this Sense, in the Text we are upon, because he there uses the Word *all*; *I have lived in all good Conscience* --- behaved and conversed in the World in *all good Conscience until this Day*, i. e. as you would have it, *I have for a very short Time of late, behaved very well in divers Respects: I have moved no Sedition, &c.* But how strained, how forced is the Interpretation! Let him that can receive it, receive it.

You say, 2. "Neither does Paul's professing himself to have been blameless, touching the Righteousness which is in the Law, prove that he was a good Man. Because whosoever goeth about to establish that Righteousness, doth not submit to the Righteousness of God, i. e. to the Righteousness of Faith, Rom. 10. 3---6. And so long as any Man shall imagine that he may be justified by the Righteousness which is of the Law, verily Christ shall profit him nothing; but his Mediation shall be to him in vain."

This has been briefly touched before. Your Argument is plainly built upon this Supposition, that a Man can't be blameless touching the Righteousness which is in the Law, but he must go about to establish his own Righteousness, in a faulty Sense; and imagine that he may be justified by it, without being beholden to the Mediation of Christ: Or in plainer and easier Terms, that a Man can't lead a good Life but he will necessarily depend upon it as meritorious of the Favour of God and eternal Happiness: A Supposition the most injurious to Religion that ever was made! For if this were really the Case, those wild People would certainly be in the Right, who in the late Times have been won't to speak after this Manner, --- that there was more Hope of a wicked Man that dies, than of a blameless, good Man: For he that had led a wicked, profane, or debauch'd Life, would probably, in the Agonies of Death at least, look up to God for Mercy: Whereas the other who had lived well, as his own Reason and Conscience, and the Word of God had taught him, would probably depend upon his own good Works, and so be damned. I can't, conceive

ceive, *Gentlemen*, how so strange, and absurd a Thought should come into your Minds ! It put me, however, upon thinking with my self what the Phrase, *Blameless touching the Righteousness which is in the Law*, should mean : For I could not readily believe, it was necessarily to be taken in so ill a Sense, that the *Person* who was thus blameless, forfeited thereby an Interest in the Mediation of Christ ; insomuch that his Death and Intercession could now profit him nothing. And I found a Phrase in the 2d Chapter of the Epistle to the *Romans*, v. 26. pretty much like it. For I suppose that to be *blameless touching the Righteousness which is in the Law*, is as much as to keep that Righteousness. Now the Apostle there affirms, *That if the Uncircumcision shall keep the Righteousness which is of the Law, his Uncircumcision shall be counted to him for Circumcision*. Which makes me ready to think, that if *Paul* had been an uncircumcised *Gentile*, and what he here says of himself, viz, That he was *blameless touching the Righteousness which is in the Law*, is true, (which I dare not dispute) he must have been a good Man : Much more then, being a *circumcised Israelite*. For *Circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the Law*.---But I submit this Thought to the Curious and Judicious, not laying greater Stress upon it (I hope) than it may deserve.

You say, 3. " Nor was *Paul's* Proficiency in the *Jews* Religion above many of his Equals, any Proof of his having been a good Man." This seems, to be sure, a little strange, that it should not be *any Proof*, that it should not look at all *that Way*. But the Reason you give for it is stranger still ; " Because (say you) that was not a Religion taught of God in the sacred Scriptures : But as the Apostle himself informs us, it was the *Tradition of their Fathers*." This however is so faultily express'd, that I shall not pretend to do any Thing with it. Even those for whose Sake you might chiefly write, are generally stumbled here ; and think you hold, that the *Jews* Religion was not taught by God : And indeed it seems the most natural and obvious Construction of your Words ; whatever you might intend.

I go on to the *fourth* Article, viz. ' That wherever the Gospel is read or preached, there is a *Sufficiency* of the Spirit afforded to make it effectual to Salvation.'

My *Answer* under this Article was very long ; and so are your *Remarks* upon it. To recite and consider every Particular, would make by its self a larger Volume, than the whole must

must be that is now to be emitted. You profess your Concurrence with me in the greatest Part of what I *offered*; and so do I now with you in the greatest Part of your *Reply*. There are two or three Things, however, which I would briefly observe. As,

1. That when you argue against me, you change the Term *sufficient* into *effectual*. Thus Pag. 37. " May not *Grace abound and reign in the Gospel Dispensation*, in all them who have received *Abundance of Grace and of the Gift of Righteousness, even unto Life eternal*; while others have not that Grace afforded them which is *effectual* to set them free from the reigning Power of Sin and Death?" You did not care to say, *While others have not that Grace afforded them, which is sufficient to set them free from the reigning Power of Sin and Death*; though this is what, it seems, you would have understood by it, if the Reader would be so unguarded.---How unreasonably then is it, that you haul in the *Papists* in Page 40, " as generally making but *little* Difference between what they call *sufficient* Grace and *effectual* Grace?"

I suppose you might intend to insinuate (for 'tis otherwise to no Purpose,) that *their* Doctrine and *mine*, was much the same in this Respect: Whereas in Truth, I make a great Difference between sufficient and effectual Grace; whilst your own Doctrine *harmonizes* with their's in this Particular; i. e. if you argue fairly: They make but *little* Difference; you *none* at all.

2. Your principal Argument against a *Sufficiency* of Grace being afforded to all under the Gospel (so far as I am able to conceive of it) is this;--- That if Some had not *more* than a Sufficiency, None wou'd have enough, or cou'd be saved. To this Purpose, p. 39, you say, " We believe that how impotent so ever Men are in a State of Nature to that which is spiritually Good, that there never was an unregenerate Man who did all that he might have done, by the Help of common Grace towards his own Conversion or ever will be." And soon after, " If Mr. *Balch* when he asserts a Sufficiency of the Spirit, &c, intends it only of those Hearers or Readers, who never resist, refuse, or receive in vain, the Grace first given; we then verily believe, (that if this were really the Case,) there wou'd not be a Sufficiency of the Spirit to make the Gospel effectual to Salvation, to any Person at all." Again, p. 40. " Nor can we think any other of it (i. e. of the sufficient Grace of the *Remonstrants*)

“ than the *Jansenists* do, *viz*, that it never had, nor will have
 “ any Effect on the Will of any Man, from the Fall of *Adam*
 “ until the Day of Judgment.” And by what next follows,
 it plainly appears that you do not think any Grace sufficient,
 which does not irresistably compel, and necessitate the Effect.
 Agreeably with what you had said but just before; “ We can-
 “ not believe that the Fetters are taken off from the Prisoner,
 “ until it becomes *utterly impossible* for him to prevail on him-
 “ self to be willing to continue in Sin.” The *Consequence* in
 this Reasoning is what I cannot see. For even on Supposition
 that God shou’d do for Some *more* than was sufficient, will it
 from thence follow, that what he does for Others must be as
 much *under* what was sufficient? May he not abound in his
 Grace to *Some*; and yet *Others* be left without Excuse, because
 what was *sufficient* was not withheld from them? --- And if
 sufficient Grace is afforded, why *may* not the Effect follow;
 tho’ it does not *necessarily* and never-faillingly follow? --- And
 how comes it about to be so incredible a Thing, that any Man
 shou’d ever do *what he cou’d*, (I don’t mean in a legal Sense,
 but in the mild Sense of the Gospel) towards his own Con-
 version and Happiness? You say, you believe this never did
 happen, nor ever will: But you don’t, I believe, chuse to say
 that it is *impossible*; because that wou’d be a *Contradiction in*
Terms, saying that a Man cannot do, what he can. --- And
 why must the Grace of God be resisted, refused, and bestowed
 in vain upon all, if more than what was sufficient was not af-
 forded? Is it impossible that *that Grace* which is sufficient to
 my End, shou’d attain the End to which it was sufficient? ---
 It seems to me, *Gentlemen*, that by *sufficient* Grace, you some-
 times understand *insufficient*, and at other times, *irresistible*,
 just as you think it will make for your Argument.

There is one Thing more that I wou’d just take notice of,
 before I dismiss this Article; and that is, towards the Begin-
 ning of p. 37. you oppose me, and say, “ But we can by no
 “ means believe there is a Sufficiency of the Spirit to remove
 “ this Obstinacy of the Will, *actually vouchsafed* to every Per-
 “ son that sits under the Gospel. ---” You know I never as-
 serted, *there was*: But guarded against it, as a Mistake. You
 your selves have cited the Passage in p. 39. ‘ It is not pre-
 ‘ tended that wicked Men have *in Fact* all that Grace given
 ‘ them, that good Men have.’ Yet you have insinuated as if
 I held, that a Sufficiency of the Spirit was *actually vouchsafed*
 to every One that sits under the Gospel. *Actually vouchsafed*;

it must imply, *received*, as well as *given*: And so wou'd be the same 'Thing' with your *effectual* Grace. Which is what I plainly denied in the above-recited Passage, ' It is not pretended, wicked Men have in Fact all that Grace given them, &c.' I make a great Difference between the *Tender* of Grace on God's Part, and the *Reception* of it on Our's: And between his *denying* Men his Grace, and their *receiving it in vain*; tho' I am sensible that in your Scheme there is not any.

I might also have taken notice of two or three Mistakes more in this Part of your Performance; but I shall chuse to refer the Reader to my *Answer* under this Article: Which let him compare with your *Remarks*, and then judge between us. Only I wou'd just say, that your Observation p. 38. " That God does not give us Grace as a *Rector* or *Judge*, according to any stated Law, --- " I think is not well founded: I believe it is, true with Respect to the *Means* of Grace, but not with Respect to any of the Fruits or Effects of God's *special* Favour; his Acceptance of Men's sincere Endeavours, and those farther Assistances of his Spirit, which he has promised upon that Condition.---For which I refer the Reader to the learned and judicious Mr. *Howe* on the Text you alledge, Phil. 2. 12, 13. and proceed.

As to what you offer under the *two next* Articles, viz. ' That it was only the practical Part that was wanting, to ' make Men happy; And ' That our Lord saw no ill Intention in the young Man, &c.' All that I am offended with (to use an Expression of your own) is, that you put in the Word *if*, and make a Question of that, which you had not the least Reason to make a Question of. Indeed, *Gentlemen*, I had not left the Matter *doubtful*, whether by the practical Part I understood " in Opposition to barren Knowledge, meer naked Assent, &c. what you call a justifying, saving Faith in " Christ, i. e. a cordial Reception of the Gospel-Saviour in " all his mediatorial Offices, with Trust and Confidence in " him, &c." I take in every Thing but meer naked *Assent*, into the *practical* Part.---And so I do likewise under the Terms, *Christian Obedience, moral Righteousness, good Works, Well-doing, &c.* tho' you seem to be very positive here that I do not. But I assure you, your Confidence is ill grounded: I never meant any other. And how you should scruple this, after reading my Sermon and Answers, I am utterly at a Loss to conceive. And so I am, how you should doubt, whether with
Respect

Respect to the young Man, I meant any more than that our Lord looked upon him, “ not as coming to him with the Treachery and Malice of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, &c, but as “ coming with some Degree of Reverence and Honour, and “ a sincere Desire of being instructed by him in the Way to “ Salvation,” when my Answer so clearly decides this to have been my Sense.----It seems as if you tho’t, that whatever I might say, since either I was not capable of telling my own Meaning, or knew it not so well as Another, it ought to pass for Nothing. But----

I hasten to the *seventh* Article, viz, ‘ That Man by Nature ‘ is more inclined to Virtue than Vice.’ The frightful Appearance of this Article, I find is much abated by my Answer : For it is at length, I think, come to this, ‘ That Reason and ‘ Conscience are always on the Side of Virtue, and never dispose Men to Vice and Wickedness.’ Innocent enough One would imagine ; yet, it seems, you cannot admit of it, “ if by *Virtue* I intend a *Series* of good Actions, that *patient* “ *Continuance in Well-doing*, or righteous Course of Life, which “ is acceptable to God through *Christ*, and which he will reward “ with eternal Life.” I am glad however that you are so far come to your selves, as to speak of a *Series of truly virtuous Actions*, or of a righteous Course of Life after this Manner ; as being acceptable to God thro’ *Christ*, and what he will reward with eternal Life. This is exactly in the Strain of my Sermon ; which has been so severely reflected on.----I find likewise under this Article, that Praying, and giving Alms to be seen of Men, is condemned as a Fault, tho’ it has hitherto been almost the only End left for the Performance of such Duties ; since to look towards the Favour of God, his Acceptance, and eternal Life, was to allow to Works a Part in Justification.

But to return from this short Digression ; what is the Matter, *Gentlemen*, that Reason and Conscience may not put Persons upon a *Series* of good Actions, or upon a righteous Course of Life in general, as well as upon any one virtuous Action in particular ? Is a righteous and truly virtuous Course of Life less reasonable, than are those particular virtuous Actions which compose it ? Or is Conscience satisfied with a Man’s behaving himself well in some Things ; tho’ in the Main he is base and vile ? This is a strange sort of moral good Conscience ! For my own Part, I look upon every Instance of Virtue to be reasonable ;

sonable ; and upon every Instance of Vice, to be contrary to a moral good Conscience.---I know that as there are Degrees of Malignity in Vice, and Degrees of Importance in Virtue ; so, the Voice of Reason and the Importunity of Conscience, may be clearer and more pressing in some Instances, than in others : But I never tho't, that Virtue was *unreasonable* in any Instance, or Vice, *conscientious* ; even in those wherein the Reason and Conscience of Men may need most the Assistance of *Revelation* to set them right.

You allow "that if the Understanding was in no wise dark-
 " ned, but clearly discerned in all Cases, (as the *Gentiles* did
 " in many) the Difference between Virtue and Vice, then
 " Reason and Conscience would indeed be always on the Side
 " of Virtue, and never dispose Men to Vice and Wickedness ;
 " and the Fault (say you) in Case of Sin, would then be in
 " the Will."---And what if in those Cases wherein Men do
 not discern the Difference between Virtue and Vice, it is be-
 cause they are negligent, don't examine, don't consider, don't
 improve the Powers of Tho't and Reason God has endued them
 with, and the Advantages he has put into their Hands to en-
 able them to make Discoveries of this Kind ; where will the
 Fault be then ? For tho' it is the Office of the *Understanding*
 to consider, reason and judge ; yet the Understanding being
 herein under the Power of the *Will*, which you own " is the
 " Fountain whence all our Actions immediately flow," if the
Understanding is faulty or negligent, as it is the Business of the
Will to put it on to its Duty, so in this Case, it must be *that*,
 that keeps the Understanding back, and is the blameable Cause
 of its Negligence.

You say, " If the Understanding be dark, and thro' Error
 " point out a wrong Way, and the Conscience judge it to be
 " right and good, and the Will follow it ; the Fault is then
 " chiefly in the Understanding and Conscience, because the
 " Will has been *misguided* thereby ; and in this Case (you
 " think) it cannot be said, that the Man's Reason and Con-
 " science are on the Side of Virtue." But you don't seem
 to consider, that if the Will has been misguided by the Un-
 derstanding and Conscience ; it is because the Understanding
 and Conscience has been first *misgoverned* by the Will. And
 yet thus it must be, even according to your own Principle,---
 that the Will is the Fountain, &c. For so long as this remains
 a Truth, the *Fault* even of Man's Ignorance and Mistakes,
 will forever be in the Will. And agreeably the Scriptures
 speak,

Speak,---that Men are *willingly ignorant* of these and those Things, which they were capable enough of knowing.

And when any who are favoured with divine *Revelation*, are represented as perishing for *lack of Knowledge*; tho' you bring it for a Proof of the Faultiness of Men's *Understandings*, to me it is only a Proof of the Faultiness of their *Wills*,---that they did not improve the Means of Knowledge they enjoyed. And I suppose this likewise to have been the Case even of the *Heathen*: For certainly it is no Fault for Men to be ignorant of those Things they never had any Power or Means of knowing. And to this I think the Description of their Case mentioned by you, viz, "That they were alienated from the Life of God" thro' the Ignorance that was in them, *because of the Blindness of their Hearts*," very well agrees: It was Heart-Blindness, chosen, voluntary Ignorance, when God had not left himself without a *Witness* of his Power and Goodness, and other Perfections among them; from whence they might have argued their own Duty to him; at least that Duty which he nextly and immediately required at their Hands: On their Performance of which they might have hoped for *further Means* of Knowledge, as on their Neglect of it they justly forfeited them.

And when the *Workers of Iniquity* are said to have *no Knowledge*, and the like, I suppose it may very well be understood to mean, either that they act as if they had not Knowledge, one would be tempted to think they had none from their Practice; or else that they use no *Consideration*, their Knowledge lies dormant, and thro' the Fault of their *Wills*, has no more Influence upon them, than if they had none.

In a Word, I believe that whatever was designed originally in Man's Creation, yet in Case of Sin there is such an Inversion of Men's Powers and Faculties, that their Appetites and Passions influence their Wills; and their Wills, their Understandings and Consciences; (which yet are very hardly bro't to approve of what they do) agreeable to that of the Apostle *James*, *That every Man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own Lust and enticed*. And nothing appears from what you have said but that Reason and Conscience are still always on the Side of Virtue; forasmuch as the Fault in Case of Sin is evidently in Men's *Wills*; which are not influenced by their *Reason* and *Conscience*, but by their *Lusts*, their irregular, depraved *Passions* and *Appetites*, to consent to the Temptation. At least, this is my Opinion. And how *unsound* soever you may esteem such Doctrine, the contrary, let who will espouse it, is what I shall not be

be fond of,---That *Reason* and *Conscience* are sometimes on the Side of *Vice*, and that Men are often, if not *always*, led into Wickedness by hearkning to their Dictates, or by their Wills submitting to the Guidance of their Understandings & Consciences!

You seem indeed to be loth to say, that the Fault in Case of Sin, is *always* in Reason and Conscience : Yet according to the Principle you argue from, it would be so. For you lay down this Maxim, " That it is an unchangeable Law of God, which " he establish'd by an Ordinance of Nature in our first Creation, that the *Will* of every Man should conform its self to " the Judgment of the practick *Understanding* or *Conscience*, as " to its proper and immediate *Rule*, and yield it self to be " guided thereby." If this be admitted, I am of the Mind, that we shall in no wise be able to account for the Origin of *moral Evil* : For the *uncorrupted* Reason and Conscience of our first Parents can never be supposed to have betrayed them into it ; whatever the corrupted Reason and Conscience of their Posterity may be supposed to do. Therefore I incline to look upon this Principle as doubtful at least, if not *false* in the Manner you have expressed it ; and think that by all Means you ought to have spent some Time in the explaining and vindicating of it, instead of taking it for granted, and building all your Reasonings upon it : Especially, when under a *former Article* you yourselves acknowledge, what to me is inconsistent with it, *viz*, " That the *Impotence* or Weakness of unregenerate Men lies in their *Wills*, that 'tis chosen and obstinate, " and consists in their *voluntary* resisting the Grace that is offered them, and that there is in the Mediator such Provision " made for Man's Assistance, as well as Acceptance, as will " be sufficient to render their Sloth and Negligence in the Use " of Means for ever inexcusable in the Eye of every rational " and impartial Mind." This is just such Doctrine as I preach : But I find you will not stand by it, tho' you have made it your own ; but will now needs have it, that the Will is always as it should be, (for so it must, if it is under the Government of an unchangeable Law of God, not of the moral Kind, but of the same Kind with the *Ordinances of Nature*, from which there is no varying but by Miracle,) and that Men are misguided, not by their *Appetites* and *Passions*, but by their *Understandings* ; their *Wills* being right, but their *Reason* wrong.

I shall only say further, that as you sometimes speak of a *Seared Conscience*, and *defiled Mind*, referring to Texts of Scripture where those Expressions are found ; this was not to your Purpose,

Purpose, since when I say *Reason* and *Conscience* are always on the Side of Virtue, &c, I speak of them as they are a Part of our *Nature*, (which was the Subject of the Discourse) as they are Powers and Faculties of the human *Soul* bestowed upon it, or placed in it by God ; and not as they are in Men *corrupted* and *depraved* by *Habits* of Wickedness. I am very sensible that some Vices, even by a natural Efficiency, weaken and destroy Men's Reason, *take away the Heart*, as the Scripture Expression is ; and that Men's Consciences may be so affected with the *Practice* of Iniquity as to give them scarce any Disturbance in an evil Way ; and that thro' Mistakes and Misapprehensions of the *Understanding*, for Want of considering Things better, (the Fault of the Will) in a common Way of speaking Men's *Consciences* are said to mislead them ; when yet this can in no wise be said of Conscience, considered as a Faculty of the Soul, implanted in it by God. For certainly *the Candle of the Lord*, as Conscience is sometimes called, that Candle which God has lighted up in Men's Breasts to guide them in their moral Behaviour, is not an *Ignis fatuus* ; it can never be supposed to *mislead* Men ; and therefore it is something else that does it, and I should chuse to call it by some other Name. You instance indeed and say, "Some do many Things which are materially Good with wrong Ends ; essay to merit the Favour of God by the Performance of various Duties ; Others pitch upon sinful Means to attain a good End. Some esteem lawful Things to be unlawful, and censure their Neighbours for doing them, &c." I readily allow that Men are liable to all these Mistakes, and innumerable others ; I perfectly agree with you here, but can by no means persuade my self, that it is their *Reason* which leads them into them. I believe on the contrary, that if they would use their Reason as they might do, they would know better, and their Consciences direct them to other Manner of Behaviour ; in a Word, that it is not from following the Guidance of Reason, and obeying the Voice of their Consciences (after due Means to inform them) that Men go into such Things ; but from their refusing their Reason, and following the *Mistakes* of their own Minds ; which, by whatever Name they are called, are generally owing to a faulty *Self-Neglect*, and subject Men to the righteous Judgment of God.

I proceed to the *eighth* Article, viz, ' That Morality is the Height of Christianity.' I shall not need to spend many

Words

Words upon what you offer under this ; forasmuch as you agree with me in it : Only upon Condition, that I don't consider the moral Law in this Assertion, as a *Covenant* : Which I assure you I do not. And I think you are greatly mistaken in saying, as you do ; that it may be so considered. The moral Law is not, and cannot be a *Covenant*, but by the Addition of *Sanctions* by positive *Revelation* : It is in its own Nature merely a Rule of Life : And I chuse to consider Things as they are; and not as what they are not.

As to what you say of Believers being freed from the *moral Law* considered as a *Covenant* ; I think it is evident, it ought to be understood of the *Jewish Law*, including both the moral and ceremonial Part of it : for this had *Sanctions* annex'd to it, and was a *Covenant* ; and is in Scripture expressly called the *first Covenant* ; in Reference to which, the *Gospel* or Christian Dispensation is called the *second*, as also a *new* and *better Covenant*. See the 8th Chap. of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, particularly *ψ. 7.* And it will be richly worth your while, when at Leisure, to read the whole Epistle with this in View. For to understand it of the moral Law considered as a *Covenant*, or to call the *Jewish Law* by that Name, is to introduce the utmost Confusion, and to render a great Part of the Writings of the *New-Testament* entirely unintelligible.

What Reason you had to insinuate, that I possibly might consider the moral Law as a *Covenant*, in what I said of Morality ; the Reader will be very capable of judging, when he has looked over my Explanation of the Article. You say, " If when it is asserted that *Morality* is the *Height* of *Christianity*, it be intended that it is the great Design of the *Gospel* to sanctify us *thro' Faith*, and to bring us *thro' Christ* *strengthening us*, to the Obedience of the moral Law considered *not as a Covenant*, but as a *Rule* of Holiness only--- " We then join with Mr. *Balch*, &c." Indeed, *Gentlemen*, I don't think you treat me fairly when you put in these *If's* ; especially when by it your less knowing Readers may be led to impute your own Absurdities to me ; Things which never came into my Heart---Have you read my *Explanation* under this Article ? If you have, you are entirely inexcusable : And so I think you must be, if you have not, and yet will venture to remark upon it.

The next Article is, that I professed to dislike the Translation in *Psal. 51. ψ. 5.* chusing the Word *born* or *bro't forth* in Iniquity instead of *shapen*. And you say upon it, " That

“ if I did not seek any Advantage by such an Alteration, to
 “ *enervate the scriptural Doctrine of the moral Pollution of Man's*
 “ *Nature* ”---There was no great Matter of Hurt in it. This
 still labours of the same Fault with the foregoing ; for did I
 seek any such Advantage in my *Answer* ? Did I not give the
 Reason why I disliked the Expression, *shapen in Iniquity* ;
 ‘ because we don't *shape* our selves neither do our Parents do
 ‘ it, but it is the immediate, sole Work of God---and it seems
 ‘ to intimate as if God made us *Sinners*, whereas every Thing
 ‘ he makes, is just as it should be ; and 'tis we our selves who
 ‘ corrupt and marr his Workmanship, Eccles. 7. 29. *Lo this*
 ‘ *only have I found, that God made Man upright, &c.*

And have you said any Thing against *this* ? No ; but it is
 possible Mr. *Balch* might intend something very bad by it,
 or make an ill Use of such an Alteration.---And can any Thing,
Gentlemen, be said or done at this Rate, but what shall be lia-
 ble to such *Suspicion* ?---Do you not *expose your selves* ; or is
 it no Blemish to a Man's Character to be wanting in *Charity*,
 that *Charity* which *thinketh no Evil*, if he be but right in Point
 of Orthodoxy ?---Is this the Kindness of a *Friend* ! Could an
 Enemy do more ? Indeed my Enemies never objected this :
 I believe those that bro't the Article never tho't of it : They
 had not the Help of your Remarks.

I trust that I agree to every *Scripture Doctrine* as much as
 you do : But as to the *Doctrines of Men* which are built upon
 the Subversion of those in the *Bible*, I freely confess, I de-
 spise them.

The *last* Article, viz, ‘ That a wicked Man may know as
 ‘ much of the Things of another World, as a good Man
 ‘ could,’ you very fully concede to ; and by it have ruined
 your Credit, with those in whose Service you wrote : Who
 disrelish your *Performance* almost as much for a few such Strokes
 in it, as Others do, because those Strokes are so *few*, and for
 the suspicious, *jealous* Spirit, which generally runs thro' the
 whole.

You could not close however without strengthening the *Im-
 pression* you have all along endeavoured to make upon the
 Minds of your Readers, that Mr. *Balch* is very *unsound*. “ We
 “ heartily wish (say you) that every one of the Points of Doc-
 “ trine whereof Mr. *Balch* has been accused, had been as inno-
 “ cent as this. It would have been a far greater Pleasure to us, to
 “ have declared our Concurrence with him, than to have remon-
 “ strated against him.” And I heartily wish too, *Gentlemen*,
 for

for your own Sakes as well as mine, that you had managed the other Points *generally* as inoffensively as you have done this. For tho' you have *added* Nothing by your Explanation, which is not with equal Advantage to be found in *mine*; yet there are not such gross and exceptionable Things here said by you, as generally elsewhere.

As to your *Concurrence* with me, or *Remonstrance* against me; you will give me Leave to say (to use an Expression of your own) that with me it is a very light Matter, in Comparison of the Concurrence, or Remonstrance of the *Reason* of my own Mind. I hope it is my sincere Desire to *approve* my self to God in my *Belief*, as well as Practice: And I heartily wish that all Men would be in good Earnest concerned so to do. If they were, I am perswaded, there would not be so much of a fault, *implicit* Faith, as there is generally even amongst *Protestants*. It is the Grief of my Soul to see the *Bible* so much neglected; and other Books so much made the *Standard*; or at least, taken into a Partnership with the Bible; and construed too in a Sense in which the Bible and they can never be reconciled; tho' I doubt not but they were intended by their pious *Authors* in a Conformity with it. It is said, that some of the first *Founders* of our own *particular religious Constitution*, were in these just and noble Sentiments, which I cannot but espouse myself, and heartily recommend, *viz*, " That nothing was more disagreeable to them than to be called by the Name of any meer Man whatever; that they renounced all Attachment to any meer human Systems or Expositions of the Scripture, and preserv'd an entire perpetual Liberty of searching the inspired Records, and of forming both their Principles and Practice from those Discoveries they should make therein; without imposing them on others." And in a Word, " That they were in the Sentiments which since, the famous Mr. *Chillingworth* tells us, after long Study he also came into; *viz*, That the INSPIRED SCRIPTURES ONLY contain the true Religion; and especially that Nothing is to be accounted the *Protestant* Religion, respecting either Faith or Worship, but what is taught in them: As also in the same Sentiments which the present celebrated Bishop *Hoadly* and many other great Men, have so nobly defended as the Right of human Nature, as the very Basis of the Reformation, and indeed of all sincere Religion; *viz*, That every Man has a Right of *judging* for himself, of trying Doctrines by the Scriptures, and of *worshipping* according to his Apprehension

Page 91.

" of